Published on the 15th of the month.

Vol. XIII., No. 12. MARCH, 1924.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Signs of the Times:—	
The Diminishing Clergy	625
Anti-Modernism in France	627
Cardinal Bourne's Lenten Pastoral	628
The American Doctrinal Crisis	629
Bishop Gore and Bishop Lawrence	631
Pamphlets	632
Hastings Rashdall The Editor.	634
New Testament Teaching in a Public School The Headmaster of Christ's Hospital.	643
The Broad Church Party By the late Dean of Carlisle.	648
Catholicism and Orthodoxy T. Woods, B.A.	661
Book Reviews:—	
Troeltsch's Religious Philosophy	667
An Intelligible New Testament	672
The Life of Devotion	675
Correspondence:—	
The Malines Conferences	678
The Argument from Design	680

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

AGENTS: SOUTH AFRICA—T. MASKEW MILLER, Cape Town.
NEW ZEALAND—WALTER NASH, 110–112 Lambton Quay, Wellington.

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

CURWEN EDITION

COMMUNION SERVICES FOR CHOIR & CONGREGATION

By MARTIN SHAW.

***AN ANGLICAN FOLK MASS** (80583)
'A modern composition with the mediæval ring.'—*Church Times.*

***MERBECKE'S HOLY COMMUNION** (80572)
Edited with Organ Accompaniment.
'Mr. Shaw is justified in producing this. We think it will win favour widely.'—*Church Times.*

***A MODAL COMMUNION SERVICE** (80558)
'The very thing for which we are asked.'—*Church Times.*

A PARISH COMMUNION SERVICE (80591)
Incorporating some Hymn Tunes.
Price **6d.** each.
A Special Vocal Edition for the Congregation at **3d.** may be had for those marked *.

By DR. C. W. PEARCE.

OFFICE OF THE HOLY COMMUNION (80588)
Largely founded on Ancient Melodies.
'Interesting . . . at the same time preserving the right kind of ecclesiastical atmosphere.'—*Organist and Choirmaster.*
Price **6d.**

London: J. CURWEN & SONS, Ltd., 24 Berners Street, W. 1.

The OLD OAK TEA HOUSE

The Largest and the most Comfortable Ground-Floor Cafe in the City.

Celebrated for Home-made Cakes and Scones.
The best Centre for Motorists. Stand for Cars directly opposite.
EXCELLENT SERVICE. GOOD CUISINE. MODERATE CHARGES.

BROAD STREET (*opposite Balliol College*).

TAILORS SINCE 1846.

CASTELL & SON.

OUTFITTING ADDED IN 1873.

University and Clerical Tailors,
Robe Makers,
13 BROAD STREET, OXFORD.
(Opposite Balliol College).

Representatives of the Firm are frequently travelling, and appointments are respectfully solicited.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 12. MARCH, 1924. Vol. XIII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Diminishing Clergy.

The logic of life teaches mankind when the logic of argument fails. The shortage of English ordinands is not without its lessons for the Church, and the able representative committee appointed by the Archbishops to investigate the matter may not only be expected to elucidate the causes, but also to prescribe the appropriate remedies.

The falling off in the number of ordinands is very serious. Of course the war is partly responsible, but the decrease had begun before the war. Furthermore, it is not confined to the English Church. The Free Churches are feeling the shortage also. The Church of Ireland is in a similar condition. In the first number (January, 1924) of the *Review of the Churches*, edited by Sir Henry Lunn, Archbishop Bernard, in an interesting article on 'The Church of Ireland since Disestablishment,' makes the following statements about the present Irish situation:

> 'The supply of candidates for the sacred ministry at Trinity College, Dublin, used to be largely in excess of the needs of the Irish Church, and thirty years ago large numbers of these candidates entered the service of the Church of England or of the Colonial Churches. But that is no longer the case . . . In the industrial towns of the North, especially in Belfast, more clergy must be provided if the growing artisan populations are to receive adequate pastoral care: and it is hard to see where the clergy are to come from, unless the present tendency to avoid the clerical profession is overcome' (p. 73).

In the Roman Catholic Church in France the situation appears to be even more serious. The *Church Times* of February 15th published the statement that there are in France at this actual moment nearly ten thousand parishes or churches with-

out *curés*—about a quarter of the total number of parishes. The writer asks, 'Will this state of things improve?' and he answers, 'We hope so, but not in the near future, for the *Grands Séminaires* have still for the most part only a third or a quarter of their normal strength.'

In the *Evening Standard* of February 28th, the Rev. D. Kennedy Bell, in an article headed 'Is the Parson Doomed?' states that the annual loss to the English clergy by deaths and retirements is 700, whereas the average number ordained during the last six years has been only 287, and he adds:

> 'The Church is not only failing to attract the most able and gifted of our young men, which is sufficiently disastrous in itself, but it is even failing to attract a sufficiency to keep up its man-power in bare numbers.'

No doubt clerical poverty is partly to blame for this, but it is not the main cause. Clerical poverty would not prevent wealthy men from being ordained, but to-day very few men of means are being ordained, and the number or ordinands drawn from the larger public schools is lamentably small. Moreover, a poor mental and social type of ordinand must affect deleteriously the scale of clerical incomes. We once discussed a curate's salary with his vicar, and ventured the remark that it was not very good for a clerk in Holy Orders, whereupon the Vicar retorted: 'It may not be very good pay for a Clerk in Holy Orders, but it is very good pay for a clerk, and mentally and socially he is nothing more.'

We are of opinion that there are two very grave hindrances to Ordination which cause the Church to lose many who would prove the most influential of clergymen. The first is the prevailing clericalist ideal of what the clergyman should be, and united to this is the prospect of ministering at an unending round of Church services at which for the most part hardly anyone is present. This gives a terribly mechanical view of a clergyman's life as full of dull routine instead of adventure for God.

The second hindrance is due to theological difficulties. Bishops who were educated forty years ago do not realize what these difficulties are for intellectual young men to-day. If they did they would dismiss inquisitorial examining chaplains, and make it clear that provided only there is the sincere will to serve humanity in the name of Christ in the sacred ministry

of His Church, the candidate's opinion on various historical and scientific questions is a matter of no importance in comparison. There is no need to abolish the Creeds, but there is every need for taking the pressure off them, and granting complete intellectual freedom to men who are whole-heartedly ready to devote themselves to the service of God. It is a most serious matter, and cannot be in accord with the mind of Christ, when a man like the late Donald Hankey is debarred by intellectual difficulties, not of his own but of the Church's creation, from taking Holy Orders; and a great number of similar instances might be cited.

There is one remedy for the situation which we hope none will dare to propose, and that is that the educational standard should be lowered. It is too low already. Only about fifty per cent. of those ordained are graduates. It ought to be at least ninety per cent. What the Church needs far more than quantity is quality in her ordinands. The priests in Utopia were few, but they were greatly gifted.

Anti-Modernism in France.

Of late years little has been heard of the Anti-Modernist Crusade associated with the name of Pius X; and there is an impression in England that this Pontiff's policy of persecution is a thing of the past. What is known in France as *l'affaire Brassac* shows how far this is from being the case.

The well-known *Manuel Biblique* of MM. Vigouroux and Bacuez has been in use in the Sulpician seminaries for more than a generation; it was a solid book, conservative in temper, and relatively well informed. The Abbé Brassac, Professor of Scripture at Issy, has recently brought this text book up to date in the same moderate spirit as that of its original compilers; the revised version has the *Imprimatur* of the Archbishop of Paris, and the approval of the venerable institute of Saint Sulpice. It has been summarily condemned by the Roman *Index*; the condemnation being emphasized by a letter from Cardinal Merry del Val, the Prefect of this Congregation, which the Sulpician superiors are compelled to read publicly to their seminarists; and by an order at once depriving M. Brassac of his professorship, and forbidding his employment in the religious instruction of Saint Sulpice in any way.

This, it is said, is the first step in a new Anti-Modernist campaign, to which the orthodoxy of the victims gives a certain touch of farce. An English parallel would be were Convocation to condemn the once popular Speaker's Commentary, or the publications of the S.P.C.K. *On commence à regretter Pie X*, is a French comment on the situation. As a distinguished French professor remarks:

> 'La sentence qui frappe le Brassac est un beau "thème à méditer" pour les naïfs qui ont escompté la réconciliation de l'Eglise romaine et de l'esprit moderne—et une confirmation pour les autres qui n'ont jamais cru à ce miracle.'

It is in fact one more confirmation of the saying of Döllinger: 'It may not be the same Pope, but it is always the same Papacy.'

Cardinal Bourne's Pastoral.

Cardinal Bourne's Lenten Pastoral is a discouraging document for those who expected much from Malines. The Pastoral recognizes no place for compromise with those who desire re-union: it insists on unconditional surrender. Rome, with admirable patience and sympathy for the erring and in the hope that they may be converted to the truth, is ever ready to elucidate her doctrines, but any alteration in them or any reduction of her claims is impossible. There is of course nothing novel in this: it represents what has been the Roman mentality for centuries. Perhaps its reiteration may convince those who had hoped that on this occasion it might have been otherwise, but we doubt if it will. It is reported that 'a fiery cross' to promote prayers for re-union is now being sent round a number of Anglo-Catholic churches. We must respect the prayer of faith, but those who are really in earnest about re-union will have to go for it not to Malines, but to Canossa.

The Roman Church in England, which claims to be securing 10,000 converts a year, mostly Anglicans, and will probably have in the near future more students in the theological faculty of Oxford than all the other denominations put together, is hardly likely to be willing to compromise her position and claims by official conversations about re-union.

The following extracts from the Pastoral make this clear. The Cardinal writes:

> 'We believe that to that Church (*i.e.* Rome), both in its episcopal hierarchy as a whole, and in its visible head, the successors of St. Peter, personally, there has been granted the gift of infallibility.

whereby it has divine assurance of protection against error, if and when they proclaim to all the faithful that any doctrine is to be held as part of the faith revealed by Jesus Christ.

'This is the fundamental doctrine of the Catholic Church, and all discussions are useless and mere waste of time until this doctrine is accepted, for no man can be a Catholic until, guided and enlightened by the Holy Ghost, he is able to accept it. All other questions of discipline, of liturgy, of devotion, are subsidiary to this. No one would be justified in seeking admission to the Catholic Church, and no one would be entitled to receive anyone into her communion, unless the applicant believes that that Church is divinely instituted by Jesus Christ to be the only infallible exponent of His teaching. Whether it be a village priest seeking to satisfy those who question him, or a foreign cardinal courteously receiving the inquiries of learned members of the Established Church of this country—on this point both can give but one unhesitating answer.'

The Cardinal has two things to say about Malines.

'The multiplied criticisms, passed by non-Catholic writers on the published account of the conversations at Malines, have brought out very clearly the fundamental difference that there is between the point of view of those who accept the supreme authority of the Holy See as an essential fact of the divine revelation, and the outlook of those who reject that authority. The latter have, apparently, lost all perception of the Catholic idea of "faith." All ultimately is reduced to a question of, more or less certain, religious opinions, in which there can be adjustments, concessions, compromises, arrangements. To a Catholic such a position is impossible; nay, repellent. He accepts with unhesitating "faith" what he is convinced to be the truth of God Himself, which it is not his to barter, to compromise, to give away.'

The statement is without foundation that the English Roman Catholics have intervened to prevent a *rapprochement* between Rome and England.

'It is a repetition of the equally baseless and uncharitable statements emanating from similar sources in 1896, of which there has been some re-echo in connexion with the conversations held at Malines. How little do the writers or utterers of such things realize what we feel with regard to the restoration of England to the unity of Christendom—how there is no sacrifice of place or position that we are not prepared to make in order to attain so great an end—how there is not a Bishop among us who would not gladly resign his see and retire into complete obscurity if thereby England could again be Catholic.'

The American Doctrinal Crisis.

The differences between Modernists and Traditionalists in the American Protestant Episcopal Church are still acute, and many controversial things are being written and uttered on both sides. The most important of these is Bishop Manning's message to his diocese delivered in a sermon preached on February 3rd, in St. John's Cathedral, New York. The

Bishop's position may be summed up in the two following sentences :

> 'We believe in the widest freedom of enquiry and scholarly research. We welcome eagerly all the light that science and scholarship can give.'
>
> 'Permitting all lawful liberty of interpretation and explanation in the case of every article, this Church calls upon all her clergy and people to believe the fact that our Lord went into the place of departed spirits, the fact that He is now at the right hand of God, the fact that He will one day come again in judgment, and she certainly calls upon us to believe, and expects us to believe and teach the fact that He Who for our sakes came down from heaven was born of the Virgin Mary, the fact of his bodily resurrection from the tomb, and the fact of His return to the place which He had, before the world was, at the right hand of the Father.'

Apparently Dr. Manning sees no inconsistency between these two statements. This may be because his idea of 'the widest freedom of inquiry and scholarly research' does not include freedom to form conclusions and to utter them. If that be so, what is the use of 'the widest freedom of inquiry'? Possibly if the Bishop had remembered the *dictum* of Archbishop Temple : 'If the conclusions are prescribed, the study is precluded,' he would not have uttered his fatuous declaration about believing in the widest freedom of inquiry and scholarly research when he obviously does not believe in it. He would instead have contented himself with saying that although the Creeds claim to be based on Scripture and to draw their authority from Scripture, yet if as the result of the critical study of Scripture, scholars come to doubt the historicity of the Virgin Birth, nevertheless as a necessary condition of Church membership they must continue to believe it and to say they believe it, and so with the other articles of the Creeds. This would not have seemed to many a very progressive or open-minded declaration to make; it might even have struck some as harsh and obscurantist, but at least it would have been consistent.

As we read Dr. Manning's *pronunciamento* with its statement, 'The Creed is all one piece,' we ask ourselves, how is it possible that anyone who knows the history of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds and the various forms through which they have passed can presume to make such an assertion? Any bishop might be expected to know that the clause 'He descended into hell' was not in the Apostles' Creed as used in

the Church of Rome and the Eastern Churches in the fourth century, and that the Virgin Birth clause was not in the original Nicene Creed. The 'all or none' argument is not only a dangerous two-edged weapon to use in defence of the Christian Faith, but in this case at any rate it can be shown historically to be false. What Dr. Manning and his Traditionalist allies need to do is to ask what is the essence of the Christian Faith, and then to ask themselves further whether they ought to demand more from their fellow-Christians as the condition of Christian fellowship than that essential element.

Bishop Gore and Bishop Lawrence.

In his autobiography, *Fifty Years*, Bishop Lawrence wrote:

> 'With the conservatism of my nature, I have always acceded to the tradition, but with a mind open to further light. Some thirty years ago, however, I was convinced that there is no essential connection between the belief in the Virgin Birth and a belief in the Incarnation. In giving expression to that conviction, which was founded on the careful study of a few American scholars, I was charged by friends dear to me with heresy. It is now a source of satisfaction to read in Bishop Gore's later works wherein he is defending the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, that he has come to the same conclusion' (p. 72).

An American friend and admirer of Bishop Gore wrote to him, drawing his attention to the statement. He replied in the following letter, published in the *Churchman* (New York) of February 16th, 1924:

> 'I cannot understand how Dr. Lawrence, the Bishop of Massachusetts, can have said that, in defending the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, I had come to the conclusion "that there is no essential connection between the belief in the Virgin Birth and a belief in the Incarnation." It is true that the belief in the Incarnation was not *based upon* belief in the Virgin Birth, as it was upon belief in the Resurrection. For the Incarnation was believed in for (perhaps) thirty years before the fact of the Virgin Birth was widely known through the publication of the *Gospel of St. Luke*. There were reasons why the manner of our Lord's birth was kept private at the beginning. There were also reasons why the faith of the Church should be made to rest on *public* events, to which the Apostles could bear witness within their own experience.
>
> 'But we have good reason to believe that St. Luke's narrative of the birth contains the testimony of the Mother, and that St. Matthew's rests upon the witness of St. Joseph. And the fact of the Virginal Conception of Christ was no sooner heard than it was welcomed by the Church and taken up into its Creed. It has seemed to all successive generations that the belief in the Incarnation was so *congruous* with belief in the Virgin Birth that the former could hardly have taken place in any other manner. It has also seemed that the birth of the New Man must have involved something *discontinuous*

as well as something continuous with the old sinful humanity. In *Belief in Christ*, page 279, I have written that the Virgin Birth will be found by anyone who believes in Christ as the second Adam, the sinless man, something "in the highest degree acceptable and congruous in His case, if not rationally necessary." In fact, men have not in fact believed in the Incarnation (with very few exceptions) who disbelieved in the Virgin Birth. Yours faithfully,

CHARLES GORE.'

The editorial comment of the *Churchman* runs as follows:

The following seems clear:

(1) That Bishop Gore's letter bears out the statement in *Fifty Years*. If for thirty years the early Church believed in the Incarnation without knowing about a Virgin Birth, it is clear that acceptance of the Virgin Birth is not essential to a belief in the Incarnation.

(2) That it may well be that a belief in the Virgin Birth is *congruous* with a belief in the Incarnation. Historically speaking, doubtless it has been from a very early day. But *congruous* and *essential* are not synonymous terms.

(3) That if Bishop Lawrence's statement in regard to Bishop Gore is incorrect, the fault lies in the language used by Bishop Gore rather than in Bishop Lawrence's interpretation of the language.

Pamphlets.

Kikuyu produced a great shower of pamphlets. Then the war intervened and Church pamphlets ceased to be published. Now another era of Church pamphlets has begun. The Anglo-Catholics were the first in the field with an extensive series admirably printed by the Society of St. Peter and St. Paul. Then the Grey Book Pamphlets and the Anglican Evangelical Pamphlets began to appear. The Grey Book series[1] is of course liturgical and intended mainly for those who are interested in Prayer Book Revision. No. 8 in this series on *The Nature and Function of the Church of England*, consisting of well-chosen passages from the writings of Bishop Creighton, the great Church historian, ought to be widely read.

The Evangelical Group Movement Pamphlets[2] have a much wider range than the Grey Book series, and the following seem to be particularly valuable: *Is God a Person?* by Dr. W. R. Matthews; *The Indwelling of God in Man*, by Canon B. H. Streeter; *Religion and Science*, by Canon E. W. Barnes; *The Christian Faith and Evolution*, by Canon J. M. Wilson; *The New Testament and the Supernatural*, by J. M. Creed. The whole series, which is strongly liberal in tone, is marked by loyalty to its motto: 'The Truth shall make you free.' It

[1] Published by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. Price 2*d*. each. [2] Published by Hodder and Stoughton, price 3*d*. each.

should do much to help the cause of ecclesiastical and theological liberalism.

The Churchmen's Union has also begun to issue a series of pamphlets. The first four have appeared.[3] *What is Modernism?* by Prof. Percy Gardner, *Modernism and Reconstruction*, by F. E. Powell, *The Modern Movement in the Church of England*, by P. H. Bagenal, O.B.E., *Modernity in Christian Ethics*, by Prof. Percy Gardner. Prof. Gardner in the first pamphlet of the series confesses that the term Modernist is not attractive to him, but if a movement or school must be known by some distinctive name, he finds Modernism better than any other. In any case it is now too late to change it. He defends Modernists against the conventional charge that they are the party of negation and denial.

> 'We have denials,' he writes, 'but they are only the result of our affirmations. Our main object is to bring the religion of Christ into closer relations with the noblest morality, the highest social ideals, the most thoroughgoing thought of our day. We believe that the main principles of the Christian religion are eternal, but that they have to be presented to successive ages in constantly fresh vesture, that the ideas which made the life of the Church are ever dawning on the world, but can never be included in rigid and permanent formulae' (p. 3).
>
> 'The critical frame of mind is not usual among Christians, nor is it the best frame of mind. "I am the spirit who always denies," said the Mephistopheles of Goethe. Lord Bacon declared that he would sooner believe all the fables in the Talmud than that this universal frame is without a mind. Most Modernists would sooner accept the infallibility of the Bible or the Pope than materialistic atheism. But for all that it is impossible to construct a scheme of belief which will endure except upon a basis which will stand criticism, which loves light rather than darkness, of which one need never be ashamed. In the past the beliefs of the Churches have been based on the systems of the great thinkers, such as Athanasius, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Calvin, who represented some of the best thought of their respective ages. And any solid amendments of those beliefs in our days must be based upon the views of God, of the world, of human nature, which can hold their own in an age which accepts evolution, a scientific view of history, observational psychology, and indeed any scientific view which can be satisfactorily proved.
>
> 'It is not a time for the Churches to impose rigid formulae, or to have a keen scent for heretical views. It is emphatically an age of unsettlement and transition; and a man is fortunate if he finds rest for his spirit in some Christian community which, while retaining a connection with the past, allows wide limits to individuals, so long as they do not transgress against the Christian mode of life and conduct' (p. 11).

[3] Published by the Churchmen's Union, The Church House, Westminster, price 4*d.* each.

HASTINGS RASHDALL

THE death of the Very Reverend Hastings Rashdall, D.D., D.Litt., D.C.L., LL.D., F.B.A., Dean of Carlisle and President of the Churchmen's Union, deprives the cause of English theological and ecclesiastical Liberalism of its ablest champion. He was no narrow and brilliant specialist such as the modern University training seems to aim at producing, but a great scholar of the older type, a veritable πολυμαθής. By *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages* (1895), *The Theory of Good and Evil* (1907), *The Idea of the Atonement in Christian Theology* (1919), he achieved eminence in three spheres—mediaeval history, moral philosophy, and Christian theology. His *magnum opus* in any one of these three departments would have made the reputation of an ordinary scholar, and many a clergyman could have passed honourably to a deanery, in days when deans carried a greater weight of learning than is the fashion at present, on the reputation won by his minor works—*Doctrine and Development* (1898), which ranks deservedly with the very best volumes of University sermons; *Christus in Ecclesia* (1904), a philosophical and historical treatment of ecclesiastical institutions; *Philosophy and Religion* (1909), *Is Conscience an Emotion?* (1914), *Conscience and Christ* (1916), *Jesus: Human and Divine* (1922), besides a number of essays and articles. Of the former the most important is that on Theism contributed to *Contentio Veritatis*, and of the latter his historical articles in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

The son of an Evangelical clergyman who enjoyed the friendship of Mr. Gorham, the young Rashdall became at Harrow a favourite pupil of Dr. Montagu Butler. At Oxford, where he read in the Honour School of *Literae Humaniores*, he came under the powerful personal influence of T. H. Green and the writings of Henry Sidgwick.

Leaving Oxford he became a tutor at Lampeter (1883), then at University College, Durham (1884), but returned to Oxford as Fellow and Lecturer of Hertford (1888—1895), Chaplain and Tutor of Balliol (1894—95), and finally Fellow and Tutor of New College (1895—1910), where he had been Scholar so many years before.

His occupation was that of a college tutor and lecturer, but his life had a much wider range than is suggested by this description. He was a convinced Christian and a whole-hearted English Churchman, and it was in the service of this twofold ideal (for it is twofold) that he found his vocational interest, but in no narrow way. In sound scholarship he had as deep and self-denying an interest as Browning's 'Grammarian,' but he combined it with the widest human interests. He was full of 'curious learning' and also of curiosity, and for that reason he was always interesting and interested. Little things arrested his attention as much as great. I remember his complaining that biographies seldom related all sorts of interesting things one wanted to know about their subjects, for instance, their pecuniary affairs. Yet this wide and varied range of human interests was all subordinated to one supreme interest, the knowledge of the truth, and this knowledge of the truth was not purely speculative, but was bound up with certain great practical issues. He was as convinced as any modern anthropologist could be of the need for religion in a progressive community; and for him the religion of Christ was the supreme manifestation of the religious spirit, and he desired with all his heart that it might prevail; but whilst so whole-hearted a Christian, he took no obscurantist view of the nature of that religion, nor did he favour fanatical methods in its propagation. He was a believer in Christian education. For him no lie could be of the Truth. All that historical research, literary criticism, physical science, moral and metaphysical philosophy, proved to be false in traditional Christianity he was convinced must be discarded, and by discarded he did not mean silently ignored, but openly renounced and repudiated. And for him nothing could be really Christian that was in contradiction to the rational and moral consciousness. Once I had ventured to argue that while as a Christian I could never believe that Christianity in its essence was irrational, yet both its theological dogmas and ethical ideals might properly be viewed as *supra-rational*. He concluded a searching criticism of my argument by saying: 'If I could not believe that Christianity is essentially rational, I could not be a Christian.' He had the greatest fear of admitting anything irrational into the Christian religion. He abhorred 'the subliminal consciousness': Pragmatism was

anathema to him. I remember his remarking in my study to a friend: 'Pragmatism denies all moral distinctions.' Yet it ought to be added that he thought well of William James' essay, *The Will to Believe*, and admitted the validity of the argument from Christian experience provided there were careful definition and severe limitation. His own Christian apologetic was purely rational, using that term as including the convictions of the conscience as well as of the reason. He had no desire to divorce the Christian religion from history and literature, but for him Christianity had to be fundamentally in harmony with the moral consciousness, and it horrified him to listen to so-called Christian teaching, which while basing itself on the interpretation of Scriptural texts and incidents, was in conflict with the moral consciousness. An example of this is given by him in his introduction to *Conscience and Christ.*

> 'I was requested to give evidence before the Royal Commission which has recently been investigating the question of the Divorce Laws in England. I ventured to suggest that the question was one upon which the moral consciousness had something to say. Thereupon I was severely cross-examined by eminent ecclesiastical authorities as though I were a setter forth of strange gods—and very dangerous and unorthodox gods too. The most exalted of them had enjoyed the advantage of a philosophical education, had sat at the feet of Edward Caird, had no doubt written plenty of essays upon Moral Philosophy in his student days, and would be quite capable of dealing with such problems in a way befitting a philosopher: yet he pressed me to say whether I did not think it was a very dangerous thing to proclaim that such a question was one to be settled by the moral consciousness. Another Commissioner, an acute and learned High Church lawyer, talked as if it really were the first time he had ever heard of the moral consciousness, and as if the admission that the human mind possessed any such activity would be fraught with the gravest disaster to Church and State' (p. 5).

Indeed, it might be said of him as he said of Bishop Butler:

> 'The existence of Conscience was to Butler the basis of Theology, not Theology the basis of Morality.'[1]

After T. H. Green and Henry Sidgwick those who influenced him most were Peter Abelard, Joseph Butler, and Bishop Berkeley, and to these must be added St. Thomas Aquinas and Plato. Once in a club library I pointed to a handsomely bound edition of the works of Aristotle and said, thinking of Chaucer's 'Clerk of Oxenford,' 'Your master.' He replied, 'No, Plato.' Some will think he ought to have said 'Christ,' who was truly his Master, but he was much too English to do that. Yet to

[1] *The Theory of Good and Evil*, p. 62.

think of his masters as a little group of great minds is to give a wrong impression. He was encyclopaedic in his reading. Walking with him on one occasion I said: 'Addis[2] tells me that he read the whole of Tertullian's works in the Latin as one of his preliminary studies to writing the doctrinal articles in his *Catholic Dictionary*, and he does not believe that there are many other Church of England clergymen who have done that.' Whereupon he made answer with a very proper pride: 'Next time you see him, you can tell him you know another Church of England clergyman who has done it.' He had in fact read, as he indicates in his Bampton Lectures, all the works of all the great Fathers and Doctors of the Church except St. Augustine, and of him he had no inconsiderable knowledge.

His influence as a 'Greats' lecturer at Oxford constituted an important factor in the Christian education which that University offers to its *alumni*. Viewed from the Christian standpoint, the tendency of 'Greats' (the Honour School of *Literae Humaniores* at Oxford) is to turn young men either into sceptics or sophists—chiefly the former—but Rashdall's influence was directed to inducing them to tread the harder, higher road of a moral and rational Christianity, and for some years he had a very real success. Even those who did not share his theological and ecclesiastical views recognized his services in this sphere. A well-known member of Pusey House remarked: 'Rashdall converts the young Pagans of the Public Schools to Theism, and then we convert them to Catholicism.' An eminent psychologist told me that Rashdall's argument for the Existence and Nature of the Divine Being based upon the existence and nature of the moral consciousness, helped him greatly at a time when he was in a state of religious doubt. His University Sermons, published under the title *Doctrine and Development*, indicate the fundamentally and rigorously Christian character of his University teaching. Some of his auditors might not be able to go with him all the way in his idealist philosophy; others might feel his ethical teaching was too rationalistic; others might regard his New Testament historical criticism as unduly influenced by certain *a priori* presuppositions, but all who heard him would feel bound to admit

[2] The Rev. W. E. Addis, the author of the *Hexateuch* and co-editor with Thomas Arnold (junior) of *A Catholic Dictionary* (1884).

that he was a weighty apologist for Christianity, and that too where it most needs one—in the great world of University culture.

Yet the Church authorities were very slow to recognize his services to the Church; indeed it may be doubted whether they recognized them at all. In 1908 I happened to call on a clergyman his equal in learning, who said to me as I entered the room, 'Rashdall has just left me, and what do you think he was talking about? He was saying that no bishop had ever made him an examining chaplain.' I asked, 'Has any bishop ever made you one?' Whereat he said, 'No,' in a humorously mournful tone. Such things, however, are not humorous, but of very serious import in a Church of which one of its essential marks, as Bishop Creighton reiterated, has been sound learning, and which moreover can only maintain its position against obscurantism on the one hand and secularism on the other, if it possesses a number of teachers of intellectual power and wide knowledge, who occupy positions where their gifts can be used to the greatest advantage. No Christian pastor will dispute the statement of the author of *Huppim and Muppim*:

> 'It is not God's will that all His people should climb the steep heights of logical difficulty or ford the deep streams of learning and research. Gentlemen who know Hebrew and Greek and Latin—like Pontius Pilate, Bunyan says—are too apt to forget that it is not by grammar, or geography, not by sound reasoning and correct glossing that the Lord wills his people to enter into life. The narrow way and the strait gate may be small, but they are simple. The one is not a maze, and the other is not fitted with ingenious and complicated locks.'

Yet on the other hand a Church whose leaders are indifferent to the things of the mind is a Church which must sink into obscurantism and superstition, and possibly end by expiring amid the throes of fanaticism and anarchy. It is this which leads us to note the neglect of this great scholar by the Church. As late as 1909 he had received no ecclesiastical recognition whatsoever, and his fate in this respect would have been the same as that of Llewelyn Davies, Dr. Edwin Abbott, and other great Liberal Christian teachers, if Dr. Percival, Bishop of Hereford, had not resolved to rectify the studied neglect visited on him and several others by the Church authorities, and so first made him a Canon of Hereford and afterwards secured for him the Deanery of Carlisle. But it may be asked:

Why did the Church authorities consistently ignore him? The answer is a simple one. He was regarded as heretical, and yet most unjustly, particularly as he never took refuge in silence, or in ambiguities, or in rhetorical evasions. He always came out into the open and discussed fairly and fully all issues raised, and he felt it deeply in the case of the most eminent of those who charged him with heresy that when he defended himself publicly and explicitly, his accuser never replied to him, nor did he withdraw the charge. There is no doubt that Hastings Rashdall believed himself to be absolutely orthodox. I remember on one occasion, speaking of a prominent and popular religious teacher, he exclaimed, 'To think that he should be regarded as orthodox and I as heretical.' 'But,' he added, 'the test of orthodoxy to-day is belief in the miraculous.' Certainly he proved in controversy with his accusers that they were merely Tritheists when they believed themselves to be orthodox Trinitarians, and heretical Apollinarians when they regarded themselves as adherents of the Chalcedonian Formula. But whether he was orthodox in the strictly technical sense will seem of little importance to modern-minded Christians. The important thing was that he took infinite pains to try and learn the truth, and then taught it fearlessly and reverently. It is true that he differed from traditional Christianity on a number of points, but this need not of itself surprise or disturb a loyal Christian, for it is only ignorance which prevents us from realizing how greatly what is regarded as orthodox teaching to-day differs from the orthodox teaching of former ages on a number of important points. For instance, there is probably no thoughtful English theologian to-day who does not regard the Divine Nature as passible, and yet the orthodoxy of the great ages of orthodoxy (the period of the General Councils) regarded such a doctrine with horror, and anathematized its adherents.

The points on which Dr. Rashdall differed from current Traditionalism were mainly these. He did not believe in the miraculous. Alleged miracles in the form of Divine suspensions of law or Divine interventions or interruptions, did not appeal to him. Like another Dean, he professed himself unable 'to see God working through the chinks in His universe.' Hence he did not, to refer to two controversial issues, regard

the Virgin Birth and Physical Resurrection as historical. In this he was in harmony with the modern scientific mind; but he also differed from that mind in being strongly opposed to Pantheism. He regarded God as the supreme personality in the universe, and he believed God to be One—that is that He is one mind. If it was said to him, 'This is contradicted by the Trinitarian doctrine of three Persons,' he would reply, 'Whatever the Three Persons are, they are not Three Personalities: they are certain eternal distinctions within the Godhead, but it is heresy to regard them as dividing the Godhead into three personalities or three minds.' In this he was, we need hardly add, perfectly right from the point of view of orthodox theology. So also was he when contending that orthodoxy does not teach the pre-existence of the human personality of Jesus. We believe that the same may be said of his exposition of the doctrine of the Incarnation as a process: and of this we are convinced, that it is the only doctrine of the Incarnation which the modern mind will be won to accept. His view is summarized by himself in the following passage:

> 'If we once recognize that it is especially in the moral consciousness at its highest, and in the lives which are most completely dominated by such a moral consciousness, that God is revealed, then it becomes possible to accept the doctrine that in a single human life God is revealed more completely than in any other. If we believe that every human soul reveals, reproduces, incarnates God *to some extent*; if we believe that in the great ethical teachers of mankind, the great religious personalities, the founders, the reformers of religions, the heroes, the prophets, the saints, God is more fully revealed than in other men; if we believe that up to the coming of Christ there had been a gradual, continuous, and on the whole progressive revelation of God (especially, though by no means exclusively, in the development of Jewish Monotheism), then it becomes possible to believe that in One Man the self-revelation of God has been signal, supreme, unique.'[3]

In expounding the doctrine of the Atonement he rejected that view of it which teaches that it was a propitiatory sacrifice offered by Christ to placate the wrath of God and to secure the remission of penalties incurred by sinners. All substitutionary views of the Atonement he regarded as immoral, and as dishonouring to God and deleterious to man.

But though a great dogmatic theologian, he was concerned in these dogmatic controversies only in order to free the Christian Faith from intellectual incredibilities which kept men back from the Christian religion.

[3] *Jesus: Human and Divine*, p. 20.

In one of his later sermons he said:

'I have tried to show you that the Church's doctrine is quite reasonable and intelligible. But I hasten to add that it is not necessary for the salvation of any individual soul to have very distinct notions on such subjects. St. Paul's simple Creed, "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself," is surely almost as much as we want in a creed to live by.'[4]

But whilst he desired a very simple Christian Faith, he did most earnestly wish for a thoroughly educated Christian clergy to teach it. He said in a sermon preached before the Birmingham Church Congress in Solihull Church, October 9th, 1921:

'I do not hesitate to say that one of the greatest needs—perhaps the greatest need—of the Church to-day is an improvement in the education of the clergy, and a changed attitude towards intellectual questions on the part, not only of the clergy, but of the religious laity. Without that not all the devotion of the laborious parochial clergy, not all the subscriptions of the benevolent laity, not all the new organizations and machineries—Assemblies, Finance Boards, new dioceses, and the rest—will avail to enable the Church to hold its own and do its work in the world of to-day. And observe, there is no safer historical generalization than this—that the opinions which are accepted by the more intellectual people sooner or later spread to the population generally. A Church that has lost its hold over the intellect of the age will not long retain its hold over its emotional life or its practical activities.'[5]

But it must not be supposed that his view of knowledge for clergymen was limited to theology. In a noble sermon on 'Christ and Culture,' preached before the University of Oxford, he said:

'"Freely ye have received, freely give." That must be the maxim for every Christian student. In respect of intellectual wealth, as of other wealth, we want to realize more fully than we do the responsibility of possession. And there is one class of course upon whom there rests an especial measure of this responsibility. Is it sufficiently realized what exceptional opportunities the position of a parochial clergyman gives for the diffusion of knowledge—especially knowledge of these two kinds, the political and economic knowledge which is necessary for social salvation, and the intellectual religious knowledge which, though it is not the *unum necessarium*, is in these days to so many the all but essential condition of their soul's health?'

In his published works his deep interest in political, social, and economic problems is no less evident than his interest in theological and moral questions. This naturally led him to believe in the religious character of the State and the importance of right relations between Church and State. His attitude here is expressed in one sentence:

'The true difference between Church and State is not a difference of ends, but a difference of means.'

[4] *Op. cit.*, pp. 68-69.

[5] *Op. cit.*, pp. 78-79.

The contrast between some men and their writings, and some preachers and their sermons is very great. There was no disparity of this kind in the case of Hastings Rashdall. His character and his utterances were in harmony. Like Chaucer's Clerk of Oxenford:

> 'Sownynge in moral vertu was his speche,
> And gladly wolde he lerne and gladly teche.'

Yet there was never the slightest suspicion of cant, nor the slightest assumption of superiority. He never minded being contradicted or attacked, and laughed heartily when the attack was most daring. He seemed in many ways a combination of Bishop Butler and Dr. Johnson. He had the Bishop's theological interests and moral sensitiveness, and the sane humanity and saving common-sense of the Lexicographer, with something of the latter's power of retort and love of argument. I remember once saying to him, as I thought unanswerably: 'What really matters is whether a man believes in God or whether he doesn't,' to which he retorted, 'No, what really matters is the kind of God in Whom he believes.' He had too the generosity which characterized both those great eighteenth century Englishmen. He was very generous, but generous in a thoughtful way. He was generous in his gifts of money to good causes, and equally generous in his sacrifice of time and energy. He freely accepted invitations to preach and read papers, and was most conscientious, amazingly so, in his fulfilment of his promises. To cite an example of this which may seem almost too private, and yet is not so now he has left us. He accepted an invitation from the writer of this notice to deliver a sermon. A few days before the appointed day his mother died; her funeral had not taken place; he was so ill and suffering himself that he could not stand to preach; yet he came and delivered the sermon, but in a chair at the head of the chancel steps. Next day he travelled back to attend his mother's funeral.

But of all his qualities, whether of loyalty to truth and duty or loyalty to his friends, that which perhaps strikes one most was that wonderful simplicity of nature which Tennyson noted in the Iron Duke:

> 'And, as the greatest only are,
> In his simplicity sublime.'

To the erudition of a *savant* and the profundity of a philosopher, Hastings Rashdall united the heart of a child.

NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING IN A PUBLIC SCHOOL

By W. H. Fyfe (Christ's Hospital).

OF course a master's secret ideal is to make the Bible a 'top-shelf book.' To bind it in scarlet buckram and declare it unfit for the young and never to be touched on Sunday. Anything to get it out of the atmosphere of duty—so that its beauty might appeal.

But we cannot do that. Parents and publishers have combined to shroud the Bible in gloom long before our pupils come into our hands. We have to make the best of what is not wholly a bad job even so.

Obviously for every reason we must begin with the Gospels, and with young boys they are easy. First comes St. Luke and St. Matthew follows. With juniors the teacher's aim is to make them familiar with the text and to give them a comprehensive view of the life, the character, and the teaching of Jesus. To get that supremely lovable figure upon the retina of each boy's eye. For the teacher's aid the obvious books are Glover's *Jesus of History* and Fosdick's *Manhood of the Master*, and others like those, but he must keep his stores of antiquarian learning fast locked up in a cupboard. There is nothing worse than *Realien* in Gospel teaching—the 'flat-roof theory' of exposition. It seems to me in retrospect that I never heard a sermon or a lesson on the New Testament which lacked the statement that roofs in Palestine were flat, so that those who sat on them were in no danger of sliding off the tiles. And there were little drawings or models of ox-carts and phylacteries and the eyes of needles. The narrative is the thing, and a little use of imagination in his commentary is all else the teacher needs. Young boys will easily feel the power of the story, and with that aid will visualize each scene for themselves. That is the object to aim at.

Juniors are bad listeners. They always want something to do themselves, and nature's prompting must not be denied. But it is a bad thing to use the Gospels as a reading lesson.

That introduces irrelevant considerations. And the halting delivery of one boy will spoil the story for the rest. Since all can have the text before them, they will follow with appreciation if the master takes the trouble to read really well, bringing out by his reading both the points of the narrative and its beauty. But he must stop often for comment and discussion, and will do well to explain before each scene what to look for, and to invite discussion at the end. If his own comments are vivid, the boys will soon pick up his method and discover points which he has missed.

That comes first—a lively study of each incident and of the character of Jesus as revealed in each. And then there are the parables and the Sermon on the Mount. Of this as much as possible must be learnt by heart. That is more worth doing than anything else, and is within the reach of the least competent teacher. And the Sermon and the parables are an inexhaustible source of matter for simple and eager discussion. The aim is to print the words on their memories and to make it clear from the outset that each lesson applies to their own conduct—and to yours—to-day.

The next stage—again obviously—is the Acts of the Apostles. This is the schoolmaster's favourite book of the Bible. A plain narrative, yet offering ample excuse for explanation: none of those embarrassing moments which come with the study of a Gospel, when the roof seems lifted off the classroom and we are left gazing at the stars. The Acts might have been written for schoolmasters, and even achieves the supreme merit of offering parallels to Thucydides. For my own part experience has left me a little dissatisfied with the Acts as a school book, except for the section which describes the growth and problems of the early Christian community. That has a vital interest to which most boys respond. But the early chapters wilt rather under keen discussion, and as for the 'We' narrative, it is vigorous and stirring but soon over—unless you open the cupboard and draw on those forbidden stores of learning.

We are now more than half-way up the school: our pupils are growing gruff and pimply. It is time to go back to the Gospels. They are now familiar with the narrative and have learnt some, at any rate, of the great passages by heart. And

their interest, we hope, has been a little aroused. Now comes a harder task, and one of prime importance. The Jesus on the retina of each boy's eye has been painted by the hand of childhood—its colour and outline are beginning to fade already—it has to be re-drawn with the firmer lines and darker shades that are proper to manhood's portrait. It is our duty—and perhaps our difficulty—to see that our pupils do not emerge into manhood with the moral and religious ideas of the adolescent. Therefore the teacher must be stark and frank. Now is the time for St. Mark's Gospel, because it is more frank and simple, less blurred by theories than the others and moves in a clearer atmosphere of reality. And the fact that it is the least beautiful is also an advantage at this stage, because the boy is growing sentimental and is therefore afraid of sentiment in any form. In St. Mark we have perhaps the best chance of getting back to the historical figure of Jesus, and we can help boys of sixteen to do this if we are frank and realistic.

That is a point which it may not be inapt to stress. Much religious teaching still suffers from a lack of reality, due to the fact that many schoolmasters still deal out to their pupils not what they think, but what they suppose they ought to think. The cause is sometimes hypocrisy, but it is far more often want of thought. Even laymen are liable to the disease of 'Clergyman's frivolity,' the most alarming symptom of which is saying things without attention to their meaning. Examples are not far to seek. It may be safest to cull one from circles whither these lines are not likely to penetrate. A very lovable and distinguished Bishop once told a school congregation that God sent a Japanese earthquake to make us more thankful for our immunity. Some of the elder boys complained to their housemaster that, since such a view was plainly inconsistent with the theology of the Gospels, the Bishop must be a hypocrite. But their master was able to reassure them: the Bishop is a Christian all right—but he didn't think what he was saying. And it is that form of blasphemy, more often than conscious hypocrisy, which mars the teaching of the New Testament to older boys. At this stage each teacher must take the trouble—a deal of trouble—to find out what he thinks; he must read and mark and learn and then frankly reveal the result. Nor is there any reason to shudder at the thought that Mr. A's presen-

tation of the Jesus of St. Mark may differ from Mr. B's. I should be suspicious if it didn't. And if the disparity is sufficiently striking, the boys will begin to take the Gospel seriously and to think out their own Jesus for themselves. *Quod erat faciendum.*

At this later stage our pupils should go back to the Sermon on the Mount to supplement the comparative lack of 'doctrine' in St. Mark. And this again must be taken seriously, so that the master and class may together employ every aid to get at its full meaning and to think out its practical application. To make the familiar words blossom with new meaning is as educative a task as ever falls to any teacher.

About the Epistles I feel doubtful, but incline to the view that none of them should as a whole be used as a class book. I know that in the Long Vacation before I began work at Christ's Hospital I revelled in the prospect of teaching Ephesians to the 'Grecians.' I buried myself in Armitage Robinson, and a score of lesser authorities. No one can have any idea what good lessons those were, but anyone can easily understand how coldly they fell upon the 'Grecians'' ears. That sort of thing only wastes the time of boys who have little Plato and less experience of sorrow. So I learnt; and ever since then I notice my tongue seeking my cheek when I hear masters saying what good lessons they give on a single Epistle. To my mind the best value is got by lessons on the life and letters of St. Paul, in which the book of the Acts is used again and passages in the letters are taken in chronological order. This will omit some of the great passages, but these can be taken as an anthology together with passages from James and Peter and John. If others can give happier accounts of a term spent on one Epistle, I shall learn humbly and keep my tongue controlled.

If a master could give a course of lessons in Eschatology and the Maccabaean unrest, it might be possible to read in school the book of Revelation. Even then I suspect the teacher's temperature would be higher than his form's—and without such groundwork to read the Revelation would be obviously improper.

If anyone has read so far with any degree of attention, he must have noticed a *lacuna.* No mention has been made of St. John's Gospel. I want to leave it out—not because I slight

it, but because it moves in a strange atmosphere of beauty, that must inevitably evaporate between classroom walls. It is the grown man's Gospel: its wisdom tinkles in the ears of youth. Passages that are sheer magic now—I remember thirty years ago at school we parodied them and thought them silly. That may seem reckless blasphemy now, but our present pupils are the age that I was then, and young shoulders carry no older heads. Let us leave St. John outside their classroom and, if they ask why, tell them it is too full of truth and beauty. Collectively they may scoff at that, but each may hasten to read it privately. *Quod erat faciendum* again.

And don't let us say—as so many schoolmasters have said —'Oh, but if they don't read St. John's Gospel at school, they'll never read it at all.' What a condemnation of school teaching! Education does not end at school. Our function in life is not to force great literature down rising gorges, but to lead our pupils to look out for it themselves, and so to train them that they turn to it by instinct, as flowers to the sun.

And this is the last point. Let us humbly remember that it is character which counts. Nobody can help his pupils to envisage Jesus, who discourses brilliantly on Q and Papias and is not something of a Christian in his thought and practice. Every schoolmaster has noticed how the points at which he labours loudest persistently elude his pupils' memory, while they retain and quote to their master's confusion *obiter dicta*, forgotten as they fell. So in Scripture teaching our *obiter dicta*—and *obiter facta*—will outweigh all our eloquence and learning. The Kingdom of God is like unto leaven. Nothing can rival the gradual influence of individual thought and example. And although schoolboys are cased for the most part in armour of impenetrable frivolity—it is their most endearing characteristic —yet we all know that they are watching us all the time with a critical eagerness for truth, which from time to time defeats the effect of that protective colouring.

An embarrassing reflection: but it is the key to the Teaching of the New Testament in Schools.

THE BROAD CHURCH PARTY [1]

By the late VERY REVEREND HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.D., F.B.A.

'For whereas there is among you jealousy and strife, are ye not carnal, and walk after the manner of men? For when one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not men?.—I *Cor.* iii, 3, 4 (R.V.).

'Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.'—I *Cor.* iii, 11 (R.V.).

IT may seem strange, and even inconsistent, that a body of men, who profess a special devotion to the comprehensiveness of the Church of England, should be seeking to add a new society to those which already proclaim to the world the divided state of the English Church. At first sight, St. Paul's indignant remonstrance with the Corinthian Christians may seem to rebuke us; and if less than others we attach ourselves to any single leader, or any particular set of dogmatic opinions, a critic might be disposed to place us in the position of those in the Church of Corinth who apparently made a boast of their emancipation from apostolic leadership, who aimed at the formation of a Christ party intermediate between the conflicting factions, who tended to make a sect of unsectarianism, a party of anti-party, a dogma of anti-dogmatism.

And yet, on further consideration, I think that we may find in the Apostle's exhortations to the Corinthians, full as they are of solemn warning for us, some encouragement and sanction for what we are trying to do. He warns us, indeed, of the necessity of building upon the one foundation—the historical revelation of God in Christ—and of the danger of putting zeal for an intellectual school or ecclesiastical party in the place of simple devotion to Jesus Christ, and to the ideal of life which He represents. And yet he recognizes fully and frankly that there must be differences of opinion, and that these are not inconsistent with essential unity. It is the tendency to make

[1] This Sermon, which was preached in St. Peter's Church, Bayswater, London, W., on Friday, 6th October, 1899, before the members of the Churchmen's Union for the advancement of Liberal Religious Thought, at their first annual meeting, is reprinted by the kind permission of Messrs. T. & T. Clark from the volume *Christus in Ecclesia* (Scholar as Preacher Series).

differences of thought or of expression into grounds of practical separation, rather than those differences themselves, that is rebuked.

He recognizes that the watering of Apollos was not altogether the same thing as the planting of Paul. There were intellectual differences between them—varieties of spiritual tone, of intellectual presentation, of comparative emphasis—which did not, however, make the gospel of Apollos a different thing from the gospel of Paul. The foundation was the same; the superstructure was different. Among the Corinthians themselves these differences of superstructure had gone far beyond any original difference between the teaching of the two leaders themselves. And the developments given by the Corinthian parties to the original deposit of truth were of very unequal value. Of the building that had taken place upon the one foundation, some part was gold, some silver, some costly stones, some wood, some hay, some stubble. The building of superstructures was full of peril, but it is recognized as inevitable; even the least valuable of this over-building was compatible with Christianity, with the personal salvation of the individual; time alone could show the real value of these varied contributions to the adornment of the living temple, the spiritual house, the Church of God.

Let us try to apply the spirit of this teaching to our own circumstances. All of us who profess to be members of the Church of Christ and of the same branch of that Church, must take our stand upon the one foundation. In modern language, I think we may say that we adhere to the three great essentials of the Christian religion—belief in a personal God, in a personal immortality, and (while not limiting the idea of revelation to the Old and New Testaments) in a unique and paramount revelation of God in the historic Christ. But we recognize that in this one foundation there has, in the course of ages, been added much building-upon. Of the vast superstructure of doctrinal and ritual and ethical tradition which has been built up upon and around the essential Christianity which we find in the moral and religious consciousness of Jesus the Son of God, not all is of equal value. There is a great deal of hay and stubble which has simply got to be cleared away. There is much wood that has served a useful purpose in its day, but which must

inevitably be replaced as time goes on. There are parts of the traditional theology which must be rebuilt; and that which still retains its value must not be treated as if it were all of equal utility or equal intrinsic importance; we must learn to appreciate it for what it is, and not for what it is not—the gold for gold, and the silver for silver. We must treat it as the speculation or reflection of bygone ages about Christ and His work, reflection from which we have still much to learn, but which must not be mistaken for the foundation itself, and must not (to drop the metaphor) be allowed to stop the progress of that living thought by which alone can the real meaning of Christianity be brought home to successive ages, by which alone can we continue the never-finished process of building up that fabric of knowledge in which every truth has its place, and in its place is recognized as part of the continuous self-revelation of God to the world.

And be it remembered, this process of demolition, reconstruction, readjustment, is no new thing. It is only ignorance which supposes that the traditional theology of the generation before us is all of one piece, all equally ancient, all of equal authority, of equal value. And it is only by a very sophistical and eclectic writing of history that the growth of Christian doctrine can be represented as merely a continuous development, in which there is expansion, addition, evolution, but no contradiction, no surrender of what was once asserted, no assertion of what was once denied. We talk about our own age as a period of transition; but in the history of thought every period is a period of transition, except the periods of stagnation. The periods that we now look upon as the flourishing ages of traditional theology—the age of Constantine, the golden age of scholasticism, or the period of the Reformation—were really the moments of greatest change. The moment that theology ceases to move, it loses its hold on the life of the age. If we want to see what happens when theology ceases to move, or moves only by the addition of new fancies excogitated in conscious and deliberate defiance of all the intellectual tendencies of the age, we have only to look abroad. There we see some approximation to a changeless theology; but what place has that theology in the real working beliefs of the average Frenchman, educated or uneducated, even when there survives a reverent sympathy

with the Church, by no means destitute of moral value? A theology which really expresses the mind of an age is always giving up old beliefs and adapting itself to new ones. And yet through all these changes we can trace the working of one and the self-same Spirit. Amid all the variations which Bossuet noticed in the Reformed Churches, and which he did not notice in his own, there has never disappeared the distinctive note of Christianity. We have no interest in disguising the Christian elements in non-Christian teaching; but, after all, I doubt whether there is a page of Marcus Aurelius or of the purest Buddhism which anybody would be in the least likely to mistake for a Christian utterance, for the Christianity which we unfailingly detect alike in the dogmatic fourth-century Father, the mediaeval mystic, and the common-sense Christian moralist of the eighteenth century.

'Well, then,' say our conservative friends, 'how long is this process going on? If Christianity is always to be giving something up, will there not soon be nothing left? Surely there must be this or that neat, compact, rounded body of well-defined doctrine, on which the Church must always take her stand? Why don't you tell us where to find it, and then we shall understand each other?' No; there is the fallacy! That is just what we cannot do! Not because we expect that the formula of Nicæa will ever lose its value (though the definitions in which it has been embodied may not always be the most natural or adequate expression of what it means for modern men), not because there are not many doctrinal statements which appear to us as little likely to require modification as Newton's law of gravitation, but because we recognize that already, for those who most insist upon the value of creeds, there are many things in them which don't mean to them exactly what they meant to former ages. Nor has the real vital spark of Christianity ever shone its brightest in the most venerable, the most necessary of formulae, for formulae hardly so much as attempt to express the character of Christ. Change, expansion, development, we must expect; and development may involve the transformation, or even the surrender, of some things which many of us now hold precious. But to ask us to specify in advance exactly what the changes shall be, would be to ask us to anticipate the progress of thought; it would be to ask us to put some speculation

of our own or of our spiritual forefathers in the place of the historical foundation which we are ever learning to interpret more thoroughly; it would be to prove unfaithful to that article in our creed in which (next to the belief in God) we see least reason to anticipate any possible ground for surrender or variation—the belief in a Holy Spirit still active in human society. Enough for us if we can catch what that Spirit is saying in audible trumpet-tones to the Church of our own day. We cannot presume to anticipate or to set limits to His revelations to the Churches of the future. Formulae are precious, formulae are necessary; but they are not all pure gold. And all, even what is of gold, belongs to the superstructure: the foundation is Christ.

And yet, it may be asked, 'Granted that Christians must think, that thought must be progressive, and that thought progresses only through differences, why emphasize these differences by societies? Can it be said that the progress of thought, or the healthy development of Christian doctrine, will be much helped by societies which, however great the catholicity of their professions, are likely to become, or to be looked upon as, party organizations?' The doubt is a reasonable one; let me try to meet it fairly.

I am addressing those who have for the most part, I suppose, made up their minds on the subject. But we need to encourage one another in our undertaking, and the encouragement may take the form of an apology.

(1) Firstly, then, I believe that at the present moment there is real need for an emphatic assertion of the comprehensiveness of the English Church. In other circumstances, comprehensiveness might seem best asserted by the absence of party societies, but at the present day we know that practically large bodies of opinion can only assert themselves by means of association. There is a real need that those who believe in the comprehensiveness of the Church should bind themselves together, if it were only for the purpose of mutual protection. There is a double danger to be faced. The dominance of one party among the clergy of the Church of England is such as to threaten the existence of all other schools of thought; and, on the other hand, among the laity there is a danger lest resent-

ment at that dominance should assume the form of a coercion which could only end in extinguishing needful liberty of thought and of action in the clergy and in congregations. We stand, then (if I am right in interpreting the mind of our society), for liberty, within those limits of discipline and obedience to constituted authority without which no organized community can live; and it will be our mission to unite with others in opposing any party in the Church or outside it, by which from time to time liberty may be threatened.

But in speaking of comprehensiveness, we must beware of making mere variety of opinion an end in itself. Liberty is only valuable because without it thought is impossible. The end is not liberty, but truth. Amid all the controversies by which we are surrounded, the most distressing feature is the appalling indifference to truth which (I regret to say it) seems to be more and more prevalent among large sections of the clergy and their more zealous lay adherents. Far more alarming than the strange ceremonies which cause so much excitement in some quarters, far more obfuscating than clouds of incense, far more dangerous than any particular dogma or tenet, however reactionary, which is gaining ground among us, is the prevalence of a spirit which condemns inquiry, which closes its ears to the results of sober thinking and historical investigation, which makes the most tremendous assertions, pronounces the most comprehensive anathemas, erects the most exclusive barriers against fellow-Christians, upon the basis of the most flimsy and unexamined assumptions; which makes it a point of professional honour to be too busy to read (that is, to read anything except the party newspaper); which is ever ready to denounce as disloyal to his Church and to his cloth anyone whom study or reflection may have compelled to question some article of the fashionable shibboleth. I make no accusation, of course, against any one party in the Church as a whole; immense reservations would be necessary in applying such remarks even to sections. I only say, 'This spirit is not unknown among us; and this is the spirit we are afraid of: there is need that we should unite ourselves together to oppose this spirit.' Many societies exist, as it seems to us, which practically tend to foster this spirit of Obscurantism; is it too much that there should be one to oppose it?

(2) But, it may be asked, how are we likely to oppose it more successfully by belonging to the Churchmen's Union?

Secondly, then, I maintain that we do want to reveal the existence of a body of Churchmen who are opposed to this spirit. If I seemed a moment ago to take a despairing view of ecclesiastical tendencies, I will now go on to make what may at first sight seem the contradictory assertion, that there was never a time when there was so much liberal thought to be found among the clergy. We are constantly being told that the Broad Church has disappeared.[2] Even of those who could fairly be described as Broad Churchmen or Liberals in the technical or party sense of the term, the number is, I believe, far greater than it has ever been at any previous period in the history of the Church of England; while most of the principles for which the Broad Churchmen of the last generation contended are now more or less accepted by the enlightened and educated sections of both the other Church parties. It is just because the work of those men was so thoroughly done that the distinctiveness of the Broad Church party no longer forces itself upon the attention of superficial observers. To enlarge the conception of revelation beyond the limits of the Old and New Testaments, to deny mechanical theories of inspiration, to question Old Testament miracles, to accept the results of the most advanced criticism (at least as regards the Old Testament), to disown an arbitrary and forensic theory of the Atonement, to profess that 'wider hope' for which Maurice suffered so much—these are opinions which no longer stamp a man as a Broad Churchman.

But if the work has been done, why seek to found a society to carry it on? For one thing, the theological progress which has been made has been largely neutralized in some quarters by its association with a narrow, if attenuated, sacerdotalism. And the general public has heard much more of these retrogressions than of the theological progress which has really gone on in the minds of many even among extreme High Churchmen. And again, where the results of thought and criticism are formally accepted, they are rarely allowed to modify the ordinary current of theological teaching. The majority of those who have accepted the newer way of looking at the Bible keep

[2] This was said more frequently in 1899 than now.

it far too much to themselves. And therefore I do believe it is well that the existence of those who are prepared, not necessarily to accept this or that particular set of conclusions which for the moment may be put forward by particular scholars, but to proclaim that they do want to appropriate the best results of modern theological study, and to bring their teaching into harmony with it—I do believe that it is well that the existence of such a body of Churchmen should be proclaimed by an outward and visible organization, proclaimed to the outside world, and (what is far more important) proclaimed to one another. And that brings me to what is, I believe, the strongest reason for the existence of this society. The number of clergy holding more or less decidedly liberal opinions, or (let me say, that I may not claim for any one section of the Church a monopoly of liberality) who hold liberal opinions, and who cannot really identify themselves with either of the traditional parties, though they may have more or less sympathy with one or the other of them, is really far larger than is commonly supposed —a minority, of course, but a very considerable minority, even in point of mere numbers. But we are isolated, terribly isolated, and many of us, I fear, are timid. Each of us imagines himself to be alone, or almost alone. And from the great men in high places who really agree with us we get little help. The young man who, at the University, has really had his eyes opened to great intellectual problems, takes holy orders very often with a sincere desire to face difficulties instead of evading them; to study, to think, to seek for truth, and to teach honestly—so far as due consideration for the somewhat spoiled weaker brother will permit—up to the level of his own thinking. He goes to his parish in this frame of mind; but does he there find, as a rule, much encouragement to live up to these excellent intentions? Is he not only too likely to find himself surrounded by an atmosphere in which professional zeal and professional efficiency are apt to be identified with adherence to a certain set of party dogmas or party practices? The man who questions them, who declines to un-church Dissenters, who will not profess a holy horror at least of such abominations as evening Communion, finds himself labelled 'a bad Churchman.' Nobody likes to be called a bad anything. The temptation to such a man is strong to say as little as possible about points of dif-

ference, to make the most of his points of agreement with the prevailing tendency—not from any sordid or calculating desire of advancement, but simply from the natural craving for sympathy and religious fellowship with his brethren—to be colourless in his sermons, and neutral or silent at the clerical meeting, to identify himself as much as possible with his theological environment, to listen to those who tell him that higher criticism and that sort of thing are of no use in parish work, and that the Church—which means in practice the half-crown manual of so-called Church teaching—has settled once for all everything that it is necessary to know, and who insinuate that any doubts, or difficulties, or scruples he may feel are probably due to intellectual pride or personal conceit. And yet, in the next parish but one, it is likely enough, did he but know it, there is another man going through exactly the same experience and craving for sympathy. It is the professional spirit in the Church that is the great enemy of thought and progress—let me say boldly, the great enemy of truth; and of what the professional spirit can do we have had a terrible example of late in the case of another profession and a neighbouring country![3] When once professional loyalty is identified with tenacious adherence to a dominant opinion, evidence makes no impression. I believe that it is scarcely possible to exaggerate the extent to which we might be strengthened in resistance to this characteristic failing in a profession of which we are as proud as the narrowest of Sacerdotalists, if those who occupy a more or less liberal or central position in theological and ecclesiastical matters could, through the medium of such a society as this, know each other a little better, confer with one another, encourage one another, and realize their unity with a large body of clerical opinion in other parts of the country, and with a body of laymen as earnest in their devotion to their Church as the lay adherents of the two highly organized and militant extremes of theological opinion.

(3) And there is a third reason for such an organization. Frankly and avowedly our society does aim at emancipating the Church from a yoke which is becoming intolerable; but we need not adopt, we are under no temptation to adopt, an aggressive

[3] The allusion is, of course, to the Dreyfus case.

attitude towards either of the recognized parties. We want rather to carry on the work which they have begun—to build upon the foundation which they have laid; and there is no reason why men who are not prepared to renounce all allegiance to one or other of these parties, but who feel the need for progress, should not join us. We are at one with the Evangelicals in regarding the person and teaching of our Lord as the basis of all Christian thought and practice: only we want to free this Evangelical principle from its association with narrow theories about Christ's work, and a highly technical psychology of religious emotion. We are at one with them in placing the Bible at the head of our religious authorities; only we must insist that the Bible to which we appeal shall be the Bible studied and understood; the Bible in the light of criticism, of science, of history; the Bible placed in its true relation to the history of other religions; the Bible studied as a whole, with due sense of proportion, of the proper relation of its parts to one another, and particularly with a due sense of the subordination of the Old Testament to the New. And I trust we are at one with the Evangelical party in the conviction that the essential thing in our religion is personal devotion to a living God, a personal Saviour, and a distinctively Christian ideal of life.

It is now generally recognized that the Oxford movement was a continuation and development of the great religious revival which preceded it. In a sense it was a reaction—a reactionary harking back to the fourth century, to the seventeenth century, even to the dark ages. But, like all really great reactions, it had in it the seeds of progress. Its intellectual horizon was wider than that of the party out of which it sprang. Christianity was no longer looked upon as a closed circle of rigid and inelastic dogmas, proclaimed by the Apostles, and almost immediately obscured or buried till the sixteenth century. The appeal to the Church in place of the Bible was a step in advance, since the Church—the 'Spirit-bearing body,' as the early Fathers expressed it—was a living and progressive society. The appeal to the Church carried with it a recognition of the principle of growth, of development, of a perpetual inspiration, not limited to the first century or the fourth. The mission of liberal Christian thought at the present moment seems to me

to be simply to carry on the work of the High Church party, and to emancipate the truth to which its teaching owes its great spiritual triumphs from the too narrow intellectual envelope by which its growth has been fettered.

Believe me, we shall never fight successfully against a narrow sacerdotalism by belittling the idea of the Church. It is its splendid grasp upon the magnificent idea of the world-wide religious community, upon the social side of Christianity, that has given the High Church party such a hold upon the religious mind of our age. What is wanted is to show that it is possible to have a strong idea of the claims, the mission, the destiny of the Christian society, without mistaking the clergy for the Church, and without making the mechanical fact or fiction of the apostolic succession into the touchstone of catholicity; that it is possible to respect historical continuity, and to strive after unity, without erecting arbitrary barriers against Christian bodies with whom we are really much in sympathy, or attempting to construct delusive bridges between ourselves and bodies from whom we differ in all but the very essentials of Christian truth. It must be our mission, not to minimize, but to emphasize, the claims and prerogatives of the Christian society—to emphasize them so much that it shall become evident that the ideal of the Christian Church is something too high and too magnificent to allow of any actual visible society claiming to be more than an inadequate and approximate realization of a great and inspiring ideal. Even in dealing with the extravagant claims of the priesthood, we shall do well, I venture to think, to emphasize the splendour of the ideal, and to show that these claims become all the more commanding when the clergy are treated as the representatives, the officers, the organs of a self-governing society, instead of being reduced to the level of a caste mechanically endowed with magical powers. Here, too, we must apply the same principle, and proclaim that priesthood is an ideal; that only so far as we can really show ourselves to be the organs of a Spirit-bearing body can we claim the authority, the influence, the leadership which ought to belong to the presbyters of a Christian society. And so with regard to sacramental teaching. It is not, I venture to think, our task to depreciate the sacramental principle, but to show that a high practical appreciation of the sacraments, of the reverent, and

even of the ceremonious administration of them, has nothing whatever to do with beliefs which, in their extreme form, ought boldly to be described as degrading superstitions, and in their attenuated forms come to so little that they elude all intellectual grasp. The more we enter into and appreciate the devotional life, the practical activities, the spirit of corporate Christianity that the Oxford movement brought with it into the Church of England, the more success we shall have in the work of freeing its teaching from the too narrow intellectual moulds in which it was cast by the Oxford leaders.

The work has already been begun by men who rank as the leaders of the High Church party itself. It is by them very largely that liberty of thought about Biblical questions has been won for the clergy, and for the whole Church. And of late years, we find the old clerical pretensions greatly modified. Instead of the declaration that the Holy Spirit was never promised to laymen, we now find, in works like Canon Gore's[4] volume on Church Reform, strong pleas, supported by learned and candid examination of historical precedents, for the reassertion of the rights of the laity to sit in Church assemblies, and to vote even on matters of doctrine. We find admissions that, as a matter of simple history, the apostolical succession in three distinct orders is a fiction, though the conclusions which naturally flow from such admissions may be evaded by ingenious expedients. And there have even been protests against a magical view of the sacraments, which not long ago would have caused distrust or scandal.

Those who call themselves liberal Churchmen may claim to be simply continuing the work of theological reform begun by the Oxford movement, and carried on by the more liberal section of its later disciples. Sooner or later there must come an end to the association of the liberal tendencies, so conspicuous in one section of the High Church party, with the attempts to revive mediaeval doctrines, to introduce Romanizing practices, to create a tyranny, not merely of the Church over its members, but of the individual priest over the individual conscience. A few minds may long remain unconscious of the fundamental contradiction between the two spirits, but sooner

[4] Now Bishop of Worcester.

or later the inevitable breach must come. Nothing but unwise persecution can delay it much longer. Very largely, I freely confess, my best hope for the growth of a liberal theology, of Church reform, and of a more social Christianity, lies in the gradual development of liberal tendencies among the High Church leaders, and the gradual diffusion of their influence through the rank and file. But this process may be greatly helped, if there is at the same time a growing body of clergy who without any attempt to construct a rival dogmatism of their own, will boldly avow that they are dissatisfied with the traditional formulae of High Church and Low Church alike; that Christianity is something greater and wider and deeper than party cries have made it; and that they will stand by one another in the attempt to free the real essential core of Christ's own teaching from the narrowing accretions of centuries, and to present it to the men of our age in a form in which it can be understood. Far be it from us to claim that it is only we, or only those in theological agreement with ourselves, inside or outside of the English Church, who are engaged in this great task. Far be it from us to represent that the intellectual task is anything but a very small contribution to the whole spiritual work of the Church—the battle against sin, the struggle for righteousness, the effort after a juster and nobler social order. Assertion of the right and duty of individual thought should go hand in hand with the growth of ever closer practical co-operation and sympathy between Churchmen of all schools. Loyalty to a wider society need not be diminished, it may be fostered, by the existence of smaller societies within its pale. The family is not the enemy of the State, nor is true patriotism inconsistent with true cosmopolitanism. May the increase of co-operation and sympathy between those who think and feel alike in such a society as this only increase and strengthen the bond which connects us with our brethren, in humble service of the same Lord and the same Church!

CATHOLICISM AND ORTHODOXY

THE terms Catholicism and Orthodoxy when used with reference to the Christian Church have various meanings. Catholicism may be used to denote the universal element in Christianity which distinguishes it from the narrow, national, and particularist element in Judaism. Catholicism is thus used to denote that element in Christianity which makes it a religion not for one nation nor for one age only, but a religion for every nation and for all time.

Or Catholicism may be used with reference to the extension of the Christian Church. It is that religion which has been embraced by the whole world. In the early days of the Church it had special reference to the spread of Christianity in the Roman Empire. It was that religion which had been accepted by the countries surrounding the Mediterranean—the world of that period.

Or again, Catholicism may mean that Christian teaching which has been adopted by the majority of Christians, as opposed to the false teaching of the heretics which had been adopted only by sections.

Or finally, it may be used to distinguish the universal Church, the Church as a whole, from the parts or local Churches such as those at Corinth, Philippi, or Ephesus.

Similarly the term Orthodoxy may be used in various ways. It may mean right teaching, as distinguished from the false teaching of the heretics. Or it may mean that teaching which is true because it has been universally accepted. In this case it is synonymous with Catholicism. Truth and universality are joined together. Truth is great, says Orthodoxy, and has prevailed, says Catholicism.

But what is there in Catholicism which distinguishes it from Orthodoxy? It might be said that Catholicism, when used in antithesis to Orthodoxy, expresses size. It is something which is universal in the sense of being world-wide. It is used to express greatness in terms of space and time; Catholicism is quantitive rather than qualitative; it is much more concerned as to whether its doctrines are going to spread throughout the

world and gain universal acceptance than as to whether its doctrines are true. It is more concerned with size than with value, with quantity than with quality. It covets a world-wide empire, and even values such as truth, beauty and goodness, must be sacrificed in order to achieve success.

But Orthodoxy, as the word itself tells us, is concerned essentially with values rather than with size. Is such and such a doctrine true? is the question it asks, rather than: Will such and such a doctrine work, or be accepted by the majority? It matters not whether a doctrine is likely to meet with opposition. It matters not whether it will ever be accepted save by the few. What matters is the truth or value of the doctrine, says Orthodoxy.

There is, then, a great difference between a Catholicism which aims at size, quality, and universal dominion, and an Orthodoxy which aims at the realization and maintenance of a value such as truth. One lives in the actual, visible world, the world of action where things are done; the other lives in a world of values where men contemplate the true. The one is active, the other is contemplative. Catholicism is a religion of action, Orthodoxy is a religion of thought.

It is not surprising to find that it was the boast of the Western Church that it was Catholic, and of the Eastern Church that it was Orthodox. It is not surprising if Catholicism is a religion of action aiming at universal dominion, and Orthodoxy a religion of thought aiming at the maintenance and appreciation of truth. For we should naturally expect the Western and Eastern Churches to embody the characteristics of their respective civilizations; we should expect to see in them Western Roman and Oriental Byzantine civilization Christianized.

We shall gain some light on the question if we can see the characteristics which distinguish Eastern civilization from Western civilization to-day. Mr. Bertrand Russell in his *Problem of China* has recently given them to us. They are these: (1) The East, as we see it in China, is contemplative. It is concerned with thought rather than with action. (2) It is stationary; it has none of the restless, savage energy of the West, with its consequent desire for change and progress. If one points out how little change and progress there has been in China, one is told, 'Why seek progress when you already enjoy

what is excellent?' (3) It is neither persecuting nor missionary. It does not desire to spread its customs and ideas over the whole world. It does not desire to make conquests in the fields of business and politics. It does not wish to interfere with the religions of other countries.

But the West is quite different. (1) It is active rather than contemplative. We almost deify our business men and our military and political leaders, and are much less ready to honour teachers and thinkers. (2) It is progressive and restless. We change our customs, manners, and modes of travel with remarkable rapidity. (3) It is imperialistic, missionary, and persecuting. We seek to drive others out of the markets of the world. We desire to lord it over other nations. We are propagandists, whether we are Christian missionaries or materialistic Bolsheviks.

And these characteristics which we see in an extreme form when we compare modern Western civilization with Eastern civilization as represented by China, we also see, though probably in a less exaggerated form, when we compare the civilization of Rome with the civilization of Greece. For the differences between these two civilizations were due partly to the fact that Greece, although belonging to the West, looked across the Aegean to Asia Minor and the East. Hence in all probability the fact that Greece preferred contemplation to action and gave us philosophy, whilst Rome, imperialistic, active, and practical, gave us law.

Let us turn from a comparison of Western and Eastern civilizations to a comparison of the Western and Eastern Churches. These two great Churches have each three distinctive characteristics, which correspond with the three distinctive characteristics of Western and Eastern civilization. These characteristics are seen if we consider (1) their interests and actions: (2) their customs: (3) their attitude towards other religions.

(1) When we examine the interests and activities of the two Churches, we find that the Western Church was concerned with the practical problem of maintaining discipline, but the Eastern Church concerned itself with speculative questions connected with theology. Hence the West enacted Canon Law and created the Papacy, the East a highly speculative theology.

The first decree of an Eastern Council was to determine the nature of the Godhead; the first decree of the Pope of Rome was to interdict the marriage of the clergy.

The Eastern Church was constantly engaged in conflict with heresies. (In the Church of Abyssinia there were seventy different opinions on the union of the two Natures in Christ.) The West was seldom perplexed with questions so theoretical and subtle as these. The leaders of the Western Church were more concerned with order and government; they left the Eastern Church to indulge in intellectual subtleties and to produce great theologians. Hence the fact that the founders of theology were Eastern. There were no eminent theologians in the West until the time of St. Augustine: and until the time of Gregory the Great no theologian filled the Papal Chair. In fact, the very word theology arose from the peculiar questions which agitated the East with reference to the nature of God. The religion of the West was active, practical, and concerned with discipline; the religion of the East was theoretical, subtle and concerned with theology.

(2) When we examine the practices and customs of the two Churches, we note, for example, their respective postures during prayer. The Eastern Church still adopts the ancient posture of standing. The West for the most part adopts the more modern posture of kneeling.

Consider the Calendars of the two Churches. The West adopts the 'new style' of Gregory XIII: the East has only just given up its ancient Calendar which was twelve days behind the rest of the world.

Then in the case of the Sacraments we see differences. The East in Baptism still clings to the old form of immersion: the Latin Church in deference to the colder northern climate allows as a substitute the sprinkling with a few drops of water. In Confirmation the East adopts the ancient practice of performing the ceremony of the laying on of hands at the time of Baptismal immersion. In the West the laying on of hands was postponed in the interests of practical religion, and so Confirmation was separated from Baptism. In the case of anointing with oil the East maintains the practice of the early Church—the sick are anointed. In the West, possibly owing to the fact that many

of the sick so anointed did not recover, the ancient practice was abandoned. The East still allows Infant Communion: the West forbids it.

The religion of the West was flexible, progressive, and liable to change. It partook of the restless, savage energy of Western civilization. The religion of the East was stationary and immutable, like the civilization of the East.

(3) When we examine the attitude of the two Churches to other religions, we observe that the Eastern Church, since the great missions of the Nestorians, has remained content with the maintenance of its own faith. It is not desirous of extending itself throughout the world. In this respect it offers a very considerable contrast to the missionary activity of the Western Church.

The Eastern Church is also non-persecuting, although the Russian, like the Byzantine Government, was a bitter persecutor of heretics and schismatics. The Greek Fathers gave a place in the plan of God for the salvation of the world to the heroes and sages of antiquity. Homer, Solon, Pythagoras, and Plato were regarded as pioneers preparing the way for Christianity. The Western Church took a narrower and harsher view.

Catholicism, then, as seen in the Western Church was practical, progressive, persecuting, and propagandist. Orthodoxy as seen in the Eastern Church was theoretical, stationary, and tolerant. These two tempers do but represent in religious dress the great fundamental differences between the Western Roman and the Eastern Byzantine Empires, or between the modern Western world and Eastern civilization. The world to-day needs both types of civilization and both types of religion. We can see that theory and practice, progress and permanence, tolerance and missionary zeal are all necessary and must be combined. Catholicism, the religion of the West, must combine with Orthodoxy, the religion of the East. But it must be a combination of ideal Catholicism with ideal Orthodoxy; it must be a combination of all that is best in these two types of religion.

What, then, can Ideal Orthodoxy give to Catholicism? It can give three things. (1) Ideals and theories whereby to solve the practical problems of life. It is foolish to try to carry out a policy without a sound theoretical foundation. Orthodoxy will

remind Catholicism of the danger of getting lost in the practical details of life, so that the eyes become blind to the vision of the Truth.

(2) Ideal Orthodoxy can assist Catholicism so far as progress and flexibility are concerned. Too often changes are made to gratify the needs of the moment—unworthy needs, the needs of the lower man. This is mere opportunism. Orthodoxy can remind Catholicism of the environment to which it should adapt itself. This environment must be nothing less than a kingdom of eternal values. It can tell Catholicism that it must adapt itself to the new conditions which are constantly arising owing to the progressive revelation of God to man, and not to conditions which arise from the materialistic desires of man. It can give Catholicism a goal towards which it can progress—the knowledge of God, and not pleasure and ease in Zion.

(3) Ideal Orthodoxy can give guidance to Catholicism in its missionary work. It can tell it that although truth must prevail, it must prevail only by using truthful means. There must be no suppressing of awkward facts in order to gain a quick and easy victory. There must be no pandering to what is base and materialistic in man so as to get him into the Church at all costs. This was unfortunately the case when the Western Church during the Inquisition told men that their physical bodies would escape the fire if only they gave a formal assent to the teaching of the Church. Catholicism must triumph only by trying to bring about the triumph of truth, and the best way to do that is first to be truthful oneself. Such is the advice Ideal Orthodoxy can give to Catholicism in its work of spreading the Gospel.

But Ideal Catholicism can also assist Orthodoxy.

(1) It can remind Orthodoxy that its subtle speculations about the nature of God are valueless unless they can help men in their ordinary everyday lives. They must be capable of being realized in practice. Every Ideal must be realized in actual life.

(2) It can remind Orthodoxy that its static, unchangeable condition, its opposition to progress, does not arise because it knows everything about God and possesses the kingdom of eternal values; it arises because it erroneously thinks it does. Its static condition arises from its worship of an idol. This

idolatry consists in mistaking a partial revelation for the whole of revelation. It consists in regarding a partial revelation of God obtained by men in the Apostolic Age, or during the period of the Oecumenical Councils, as the complete revelation of God. Catholicism will remind Orthodoxy that revelation is progressive, that the whole of God's revelation has not as yet been received by men, but is in progress of being received. Catholicism will remind Orthodoxy of the need of progress and flexibility in the matter of doctrine. Doctrines must constantly change so as to embody new knowledge of God and new knowledge of man.

(3) Ideal Catholicism can remind Orthodoxy that tolerance is not the same as apathy and indifference. It is not sufficient to contemplate truth and say it is good—we are to co-operate with God in making truth prevail. Hence the need of missionary work.

But to-day we see the ascendancy of Catholicism in the bad sense of the word. For this is a period of opportunism. Men are more concerned with the spread of doctrines than with their truth. The attitude of the popular preacher, of the religious propagandist, is only too often that of the unscrupulous opportunist. Will such and such teaching gain the approval of the majority? Will such and such a form of worship gratify the senses of the people? These are the questions which men ask to-day. And that is why it would appear that of the two types of religion it is Ideal Orthodoxy which we need to-day as a check to Catholic opportunism.

T. Woods.

BOOK REVIEWS

TROELTSCH'S RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY

It is a fortunate circumstance that Dr. Sleigh's book[1] appears almost simultaneously with the Lectures on Christian Thought[2] by the late Professor Troeltsch. A pathetic interest attaches to these lectures. It was Troeltsch's intention to come over to England to deliver them last March. The first, *The Place of Christianity among the World Religions*, was to be delivered at the University of Oxford; the next three, *Ethics and the Philosophy of History*, were to be addressed to the advanced

[1] *The Sufficiency of Christianity and Ernst Troeltsch.* By R. S. Sleigh. (London: James Clarke and Co.; 12/6.)

[2] *Christian Thought: Its History and Application.* By Ernst Troeltsch. (University of London Press; 5/-.)

students in theology of the University of London; the last lecture, in the volume *Politics, Patriotism and Religion*, was written for delivery before the London Society for the Study of Religion. But the visit to England to which Troeltsch had for many years looked forward was not to be. He passed away as it was on the point of taking place; and some of us who had been anxious to see the man and to hear his voice have to content ourselves with the last efforts of his pen. These lectures and Dr. Sleigh's book should be read together. In fact Dr. Sleigh's volume is an almost indispensable introduction to them. It is a critical survey of Troeltsch's attitude towards the religious problem and it will well repay the reader who is at the pains to master it. It is to be borne in mind that Troeltsch in the words of Professor Fulton, who writes a brief introduction to Dr. Sleigh's book,

> 'has been a dominating figure in European thought since the beginning of the present century and has been widely recognised as the leader of the systematic side of the so-called religio-historical school of theology. It is perhaps too early to estimate his influence on the mind of his contemporaries; but it may be that the claim here made for him will yet be justified—that in him the modern spirit has found not only a voice, but also its most comprehensive expression.'

Troeltsch's mind ranged over such a wide field—historical, philosophical, theological—and most of his writings are so unsystematic in form that Dr. Sleigh set himself no easy task when he undertook to present us with an exposition of his religious philosophy. It must be admitted that in the space at his command he has acquitted himself with marked ability; for English readers his book is almost indispensable, and it is to be hoped that it will command the attention which it deserves. He informs us that after being appointed Cunningham Fellow of the New College, Edinburgh, he went to Heidelberg where Troeltsch was a Professor of Theology, and his book is the outcome of his study of Troeltsch's thought. It is the work of a highly trained mind with a wide and intimate knowledge of the problems confronting the Christian faith in the modern world. It is with these problems in view that Dr. Sleigh's volume is written; it is as he says himself an 'enquiry concerning the nature and modern possibilities of the Christian religion.' It was while he was brooding upon this momentous theme that he came across the writings of Troeltsch and found to his surprise and satisfaction that to a large extent they coincided with dimly apprehended conceptions of his own.

According to Troeltsch, and on this point Dr. Sleigh agrees with him, Christianity in its ecclesiastical form occupies a precarious position in the modern world. Ecclesiasticism in all its embodiments, whether Catholic or Protestant, is steadily losing its hold upon the contemporary mind. It is losing its hold not because the mind of the man of to-day, as some suggest, has become overwhelmingly secularised, but because the abiding substance of religious truth is clothed in an antiquated dialect which has lost its original vitality or is no longer understood. It is the contention of many of the best friends of religion that traditional Christianity as presented by ecclesiasticism hardly offers a reasonable ideal to ordinary men and women or a worthy ideal to generous and cultured minds. The confusion and uncertainty of the times reveal themselves in demands for a radical transformation of traditional Christianity; or for the elimination of religion from modern civilisation; or for some vague substitute which will give satisfaction to the religious sentiment. This is a situation which has to be examined and faced. It is futile to deplore its existence; it is there confronting us with implacable persistency; and it will not disappear

till we have acquired an adequate insight into the conditions which have produced it. We must first understand causes before we can prescribe remedies. This is the task, which Troeltsch in his laborious career prepared himself for with characteristic German thoroughness, and set himself to perform. In the first place he dissents from the traditional method of presenting the Christian faith to the modern world. This method he describes as the dogmatic method and to its claims and pretensions he opposes the historical method. The dogmatic truth

> 'rests upon the assumption of the dual nature of history as natural and supernatural. The ground of this dualism lies in a dualistic metaphysic of the nature of God and man. According to this metaphysic God operates not normally in the historical sphere but abnormally, in order that he may transform man, a natural creature morally poisoned, by a supernatural change. Thus God redemptively steps into the historical arena at a given point and time, declaring His presence in an absolute Personality, or in man's life in the experience of a truly "supernatural" conversion. This metaphysic is clear enough; but it is not in any way demonstrably true. In fact it rather dislikes any rational scrutiny at all, and is in violent contradiction to all the other legitimate interests of knowledge. Its idea of "Special Providences" and supernatural insteppings seems to suggest an "absentee" God who is heedless of us at other times. It is doubtless pleasing to the childish phantasy to think of God as a kind of glorified Aladdin with his lamp: and perhaps necessary for such as are of weaker capacity. But this mythology is distasteful to sober reflection, which sees that it is in opposition to the conception of man's life as an ethical enterprise, and of his world as his working partner.'

In opposition to this dogmatic method the historical method rests upon the fundamental thought

> 'of the unity and similarity of all spiritual life and activity. Accordingly it seeks to comprehend the phenomena of history within a unitary "totality"—the unification and reconstruction of historical phenomena exhibiting the disclosure and development of spiritual values within the living body of history. . . The historical method is the essential Protestant principle which has gradually been coming, since Deism, to its full significance, range, and centrality in the elucidation of history. The dogmatic method is antiquated, abandoned in all other realms. Only in the ecclesiastical does it linger on, much as cabs are set apart for funerals in these days of motor cars: and even there it receives little recognition, as for example in the study of the Old Testament, and of Church history; the primitive age of Christianity apart.'

History in the mighty march of all its manifestations through the centuries is a revelation of the divine spirit; it is on this revelation in all its comprehensiveness and significance that religious truth must rest. On any narrower basis than this, we obtain but a dim and inadequate conception of it. Our traditional conceptions of religious truth are of this inadequate character. It is for this reason that they have so largely lost their power of appeal to the modern mind.

From the historical method of approaching the religious problem we pass to a consideration of what religion is in itself, or in other words to the philosophy of religion. According to Troeltsch's conception of it, it is an irreducible constituent of the human spirit. It is not an attitude of

mind derived either from morality or philosophy, it is an inherent characteristic of the mind itself. It possesses an independent existence of its own. As reason obeys an internal necessity, which is peculiarly its own, so does religion. Religious thought has its *'a priori'* like rational forms of thought. In its forms of expression it resembles the artistic imagination; but it differs fundamentally from the artistic imagination in this essential point, that its forms of expression however imaginative are all attempts to apprehend superhuman realities. The mythical, symbolical, poetic nature of religious thought must not be allowed to obscure the fact that it possesses a positive content, a principle of reality, a value among other values, just as real as theirs, and just as essential to man.

The forms in which the religious consciousness manifests itself are immensely varied in character as well as in value. The religions which have existed in the past and are now to be found in the world around us are a proof of this. The question arises: Which of these forms is best calculated to express the religious consciousness in all its fulness, depth, comprehensiveness and purity? Among the great living religions competing for the suffrages of men we have perhaps at the top of the list Brahmanism, Buddhism, Mahommedanism, Christianity. Which of these is the best type of religion? Which of them gives the most satisfaction to all the elements of which the religious sentiment is composed? The Western mind decides in favour of the Christian religion. This leads on to the consideration as to what is the distinctive character of the Christian religion. Wherein does it differ from religion in general; wherein does it differ from all other religions by characteristics which are distinctly its own. In other words, to quote the title of Harnack's famous book: 'What is the essence of Christianity?' In his answer to this question Troeltsch differs from Harnack and approaches nearer the position of Loisy. According to Harnack its essence consists in the teaching of Christ himself. He is the ultimate source and standard of Christian truth and the nearer we are to this source and standard the closer we are to the soul and spirit of Christianity. Troeltsch does not believe that the essence of Christianity can be so simply formulated. He considers that there is a real unity underlying all the diverse historical forms of Christianity: he admits the principle of historical development: he believes that we can only grasp Christianity in all its diversity, wealth, and power, if we look at it not merely in its origins but in its totality. His apprehensions as to ecclesiasticism would not permit him to adopt Loisy's formula, *'Le Christ dans l'eglise et Dieu dans le Christ'*: he believes too deeply in the value of the sects to adopt it, but if the Church is to be understood in the widest possible sense as the expression of the Mythos and the Logos of the Christian faith in all its supreme manifestations, then the difference between Troeltsch and Loisy assumes comparatively small proportions.

I must now reluctantly part company with Dr. Sleigh's book, and in doing so commend it once more to the English reader as an invaluable introduction to the study of one of the most stimulating and suggestive of contemporary religious thinkers. We at once feel this when we take up the little volume of lectures he has left behind him as a sort of legacy to the English speaking world: *Christian Thought, its History and Applications*. This volume has been very carefully edited by Baron von Huegel. It is not, it must be admitted, easy reading. In this respect it is like the rest of Troeltsch's writings. But the editor has done his best by an Introduction and an excellent index to smooth our path. I have not seen the German original. I do not know whether or not it has been

published in Germany; but the translation reads well, and it is evident that considerable pains have been spent upon it by the translators. The first essay on the place of the Christian religion among the religions of the world is a restatement with modifications of a small book first published by Troeltsch twenty-three years ago and re-issued in a second edition in 1912 on the absolute character of Christianity in face of the history of religion. It is perhaps the most important lecture in the volume. In this lecture he deals very tenderly and sympathetically with non-Christian religions. There may be, he says, mutual understanding between the great comprehensive religions if they are willing to

> 'renounce those sorry things—self-will and the spirit of violent domination. If each strives to fulfil its own highest potentialities, and allows itself to be influenced therein by the similar striving of the rest, they may approach and find contact with each other. Some striking examples of such a contact are recorded in Canon Streeter's *The Sadhu*, and in Dr. Schweitzer's volume *The Verge of the Primitive Forest*. But so far as human eye can penetrate into the future, it would seem probable that the great revelations to the various civilizations will remain distinct, in spite of a little shifting of their several territories at the fringes; and that the question of their several relative values will never be capable of objective determination, since every proof thereof will pre-suppose the special characteristics of the civilisation in which it arises.'

It will be seen from this that Troeltsch's attitude towards the non-Christian religions is somewhat similar to Max Müller's. As far as I remember, Max Müller was of opinion that the best way to Christianise the East was to point out the similarity between the higher Oriental faiths at their best and certain aspects of Christian truth. How far this method would lead the Oriental to embrace Christianity as a whole, it is difficult to say: it would in all probability lead him to set a new value on what is highest and best in his own faith.

I observe that Baron von Huegel in his introduction criticises Troeltsch's view as to the nature of religious truth. Troeltsch's critic maintains that it is 'polymorphous':

> 'A truth,' says Troeltsch, 'which in the first instance is *a truth for us* does not cease because of this to be very Truth and Life. What we learn daily through our love for our fellow-men, namely, that they are independent beings with standards of their own, we ought also to be able to learn through our love for mankind as a whole—that here too there exist autonomous civilisations with standards of their own. This does not exclude rivalry, but it must be a rivalry for the attainment of interior purity and clearness of vision. If each racial group strives to develop its own highest potentialities, we may hope to come nearer to one another. This applies to the great world-religions, but it also applies to the various religious denominations, and to individuals in their intercourse with one another. In our earthly experience the Divine Life is not One, but Many. But to apprehend the One in the Many constitutes the special character of love.'

In his introduction Baron von Huegel criticises adversely this conception of truth. He describes it as polymorphous. It is manifestly opposed to the conception of it as held by the Roman Church. It may be that I do not rightly apprehend the Baron's arguments, but to me they are not convincing as against Troeltsch. I regret that considerations

of space prevent me from dealing with the remaining lectures in the volume. They are all deeply interesting, full of new points of view, and stimulating in a high degree. *Christian Thought* is a volume which should be in the hands of all serious students of religious thought.

W. D. MORRISON.

ST. MARYLEBONE RECTORY, W.1.

AN INTELLIGIBLE NEW TESTAMENT.

In publishing his lectures on *The Making and Meaning of the Bible*,[1] Mr. George Barclay has definitely in view the needs of young men and women who want to be told something of the more or less assured results of modern criticism. We know of no book of its size which will supply those needs more adequately than the present volume. The first five chapters deal with the Old Testament in such a way as to give the reader the right point of view as to its contents, purpose, and permanent significance. Mr. Barclay knows well enough that those contents are but too often a stumbling-block to the modern man, and he says frankly that 'we must be very careful not to allow Old Testament ideas of God to dominate our Christian thinking.' The treatment of the Prophets is helpful, and of a kind to make us ask for more, while the chapter on the Book of Jonah, a book of which 'the real and beautiful meaning has too long been hidden behind the enormous bulk of the whale,' will gladden the heart of the missionary and the League of Nations enthusiast.

The author's treatment of the New Testament is almost equally satisfactory. In a single chapter on the Epistles we are given an insight into their essential character, and it is made clear that in the writings of Paul we possess not doctrinal treatises, but the correspondence of a busy missionary, whose theology is always in close touch with life, and whose judgments on particular questions affecting the welfare of this or that local community of Christians are not to be regarded as necessarily binding for all time. The chapter on the first three Gospels serves as a useful introduction to the Synoptic problem, enabling the ordinary reader to obtain a clear understanding of their close literary dependence. In his treatment of the Fourth Gospel Mr. Barclay takes his stand with the conservatives. He leaves open the question of authorship, but would have us believe that the writer must have known Jesus personally, and he is anxious to account for differences in style and subject matter by the theory that the Johannine discourses were delivered to Jerusalem audiences. Is it not time for this suggestion to be frankly dropped in view of the fact that the discourse on the Bread of Life in chapter 6 is expressly represented as having been spoken to the crowd at Capernaum?

Dr. E. F. Scott's small volume, *The New Testament To-day*,[2] consists of four chapters on the right of the New Testament still to maintain the position of paramount importance which it has occupied hitherto in the Christian Church. The answers to those who in the present day would seek to dethrone it are clear and trenchant. In the New Testament we have the guarantee of the permanence of the Christian tradition. Further, it must always hold its place of central significance, inasmuch as Christianity is essentially a historical religion. Again, it displays clearly the impression which Jesus made upon His contemporaries, and finally its

[1] *The Making and Meaning of the Bible*, by George Barclay. (S.C.M., 1923; pp. 168; 4/- and 2/6.)

[2] *The New Testament To-day*, by E. F. Scott. (The Macmillan Company, 1923; pp 92; 3/6.)

right to a position of primacy is guaranteed by the universality of its appeal. For all that, the New Testament which modern scholars offer us is not the New Testament of our fathers. While it is true that the figure of the historic Jesus stands out with increased clearness, yet criticism has proved beyond all doubt the largely fortuitous character of the documents, their essentially local and controversial origin, the widely divergent points of view held by the different writers, and the rapidity with which changes and developments of far-reaching importance could take place in the early days. While the historical method has given us a New Testament at once more intelligible, more comprehensive, and (so to say) more tolerant, that method by itself, concerned as it must always be primarily with processes rather than with values, can never lead us to a true understanding of the unique experience which the writers are struggling to record. Unless we can catch something of their spirit, knowledge of dates and sources will profit little.

That the New Testament is a product of its time, and not a book the authors of which were magically protected from extraneous and not improbably corrupting influences, has become increasingly evident from a closer study both of the contemporary life of the Roman Empire, and of the great mass of Jewish literature which finds no place in the Old Testament itself. Jewish Apocalypses and the syncretistic faiths of the surrounding heathenism have alike exercised a much more definite influence upon the formulation of Christian thought than older interpreters of the New Testament would have been willing to allow. So much must be granted. Yet Dr. Scott refuses to identify Christianity with its eschatological background, nor will he consent to describe it as one among many mystery religions, and differing from these only in the fact of its survival. That survival, he holds, was no accident, but a proof of intrinsic superiority. The very adaptability of the new faith, its power of attraction, and still more of transformation and of selection—these are the most striking indications of both its originality and inherent worth.

How, then, it is asked, can the essence of the Christian Gospel be preserved intact for the modern world? While in our own day religion may appear to have suffered a temporary eclipse (and Dr. Scott is not unprepared with reasons in explanation of this phenomenon), yet the Christian values are ultimate; Christianity can have no serious rival among other faiths, and the modern world, with its craving for international brotherhood, its consciousness that the true aims of life are spiritual, its increasing sense both of the mystery of existence and of the abiding worth of the Christian moral standards, is peculiarly fitted to receive and to profit by a fresh presentation of the significance of the New Testament of the kind which scholars are now in a position to supply.

Dr. Scott tells us that the New Testament 'seems destined in the age now opening to play a greater part than ever before, that while the specific Christian doctrines may disappear, or suffer such a change that we shall hardly know them, yet the conceptions which lie at the heart of the Gospel are in their nature ultimate, and that while creeds, whatever may have been their former value, have broken down . . . Jesus still commands the world's reverence and devotion.' There is much here that is well and truly said, and no writer could have presented the case for the New Testament with more weight, greater clearness, or higher ability than Dr. Scott. Yet we close the book with a sense of disappointment that so distinguished an authority should have lent his influence to support those who decry theology, make mock at dogma, and belittle creeds. If the historical Jesus still commands the world's reverence and devotion,

then attempts to explain the permanent significance of His Person must surely be encouraged rather than deprecated, and if this be so, it will follow logically that the creeds which enshrine for us the endeavours of earlier thinkers to arrive at the truth deserve something better than the rather contemptuous dismissal accorded them by a great Christian scholar of our own day.

In his book, *Visions of Hope and Fear*,[3] Mr. G. W. Thorn makes a gallant attempt to render 'the wild riot of the Apocalypse' (as Dr. Inge once termed it) not merely intelligible to the ordinary reader, but of positive and distinctive value as a message to the modern world. He presents vividly enough the background against which the Apocalypse must be viewed in order to be understood. We are asked to think of the book as a unity, to reject decisively any scissors and paste theory of its composition, and to exercise our imagination in picturing the process by which the visions took form in the mind of this Christian prophet. The visions, we are urged to believe, are genuine visions, though coloured inevitably by the author's subconscious memories of apocalyptic imagery. Admittedly, therefore, there is much in the book of which the spirit is Jewish rather than essentially Christian. Yet for all that, the fact of Christ, exalted, victorious, all-sovereign, is the dominating conception throughout. Mr. Thorn rightly argues that while a crucified and a militant Christ are alike necessary to the faith of a Christian, the Cross must never be eliminated from our pictures of Jesus glorified, since only in the power of the Cross is victory won. Unfortunately the author of the Apocalypse, despite his insistence upon the death of Christ in more than one splendid passage, frequently fails to hold together the two conceptions of love and power, with the result that Mr. Thorn finds it necessary on more than one occasion to apologise for the presence in the book of presentations of the divine character which are very far from Christian, and closely akin to the vindictive utterances of Jewish apocalypses. He tells us frankly that 'the conception of God in the Apocalypse follows much more closely the lines of Old Testament thought than that given in the Gospels,' and again that 'the whole conception of the glorified Christ is shaped and moulded by ideas of Jewish prophecy and apocalypse.' These are serious indictments, and if we regard them as just, we are surely compelled to ask whether, even when the presence in the book of certain magnificent passages has been ungrudgingly admitted, the influence of the Apocalypse throughout the centuries may not have proved more harmful than beneficial in its effect on Christian thinking. As a product of its age the book must ever remain of interest to the student of the New Testament, but it may well be doubted whether, taken as a whole, its message is either sufficiently intelligible or sufficiently Christian to reach effectively the heart and conscience of the modern man.

The man who is afire with his subject, and who writes with the enthusiasm of a pioneer and the exhilaration of one who believes himself in the sure possession of truths hitherto unrecognised, certainly deserves a sympathetic hearing. Dr. Still, in offering a new interpretation of the *Acts of the Apostles*,[4] believes that he has hit upon a theory of its origin and composition, which not only establishes in detail the accuracy of its contents, but explains satisfactorily the author's seemingly remarkable omissions, establishes for the second and third Gospels a far earlier date than has hitherto been even tentatively suggested, and throws such a flood of new light on Christian origins as to demand the entire reconstruction

[3] *Visions of Hope and Fear*, by George W. Thorn. (S.C.M., 1923; pp. 175; 4/- and 2/6.)
[4] *St. Paul on Trial*, by J. Ironside Still, D.D., (S.C.M., 1923; pp. 300; 7/6.)

of the first thirty years of the Church's history. Briefly, we are to consider that *Acts* was written with one aim, and one aim only—the provision of a document of such a character that it might be placed with advantage in the hands of those responsible for the trial of Paul's case in the Roman court. The book was written, so we are to believe, by Luke, Mark, and Philip in collaboration, during Paul's imprisonment at Cæsarea, with the primary object of providing in advance answers to the questions which would necessarily be asked at the forthcoming trial.

While offering no opinion upon the soundness of the author's main thesis, and while respecting his transparent sincerity and undoubted knowledge of his subject, we regard it as highly probable that not a few of Dr. Still's contentions will be rather narrowly scrutinised by New Testament scholars. It is something of a surprise, for instance, to find our second Gospel dated as early as 46 A.D., and to have it taken for granted that written accounts of the life of Jesus were from the first regarded as Scripture, and used extensively by Paul in his missionary work. The placing of I *Timothy* between I and II *Corinthians*, and the confident suggestion that the distinctive character of the Pastoral Epistles is due to the circumstance that they alone were written by the hand of Paul himself, are alike somewhat startling at first glance. No less unconventional is the explanation offered of the speaking with tongues on the Day of Pentecost, when, so we are assured, the wonder lay solely in the fact that the Apostles offered praise to God in Greek, the common speech of work-a-day life, instead of in Hebrew, the language sacred to religious utterance. Again, not only are we invited to accept *Galatians* as the earliest extant letter of Paul, and to suppose that all the 'Imprisonment Epistles' were written from Cæsarea (suggestions which do not lack a measure of support from other scholars), but II *Peter* is presented to us as genuine, without so much as a hint of the weight of opinion against it, and all these novel hypotheses are offered for our acceptance, not with any degree of tentativeness, but as conclusions positively demanded by irrefutable evidence—evidence, moreover, to which the great majority of scholars have been strangely blind. A slavish adherence on the part of a critic to the conclusions of his predecessors may well be deprecated, but we are afraid that in not a few instances Dr. Still has confused a sturdy independence of judgment with an attitude of mind not far removed from cocksureness, and the confusion is the more regrettable in view of the undeniable interest which a careful study of his book cannot fail to create in the reader's mind.

W. M. Pryke.

THE LIFE OF DEVOTION.

We are indebted to the Dean of St. Paul's for notable contributions to Theology, and also for fearless and penetrating discussions of some of the major problems of the age. We are still more in his debt for his latest book.[1] To those—and we fear they are many—who do not know his *Speculum Animae*, this book may be a surprise. The Dean has followed the excellent tradition of English Theology that its professors are pastors and priests as well as scholars. The Dean has written simply of personal religion. His wide scholarship has enabled him to develop his thought with the aid of quotations from the poets of all ages, from the Fathers, and from the Mystics, which form an attractive feature of the book. The

[1] *Personal Religion and the Life of Devotion.* (Longmans; 2/6.)

quotations from the Bible arrest attention both for their number and their appositeness. Like Augustine, the Dean takes the old phrase, and by its setting makes it live for us. But the comparatively high standard of education necessary for the understanding of the Dean's other works is not required here with the exception of the first chapter. With a master's simplicity he has written of personal religion for the old and for the young, for the learned and for the unlearned. As the Bishop of London, who writes an Introduction, says, 'We have a revelation here of where the author lives.' And we imagine that for most its value and inspiration will lie as much in the man it reveals as in the thoughts it contains. Those who have learned of the great Christian thinkers of the past will find little which is original, but much that is best in the Christian tradition, welded into a living whole by another human experience. Those who know the 'Confessio Fidei' in *Outspoken Essays* (2nd series), and the Dean's other works will find all the leading ideas reproduced in his latest volume. But not as ideas thrown out as a challenge to the thoughtless, the shallow, or the sceptical, but as the vital principles by which 'a man' lives.

The first chapter is in the main introductory. The second chapter on the Soul's Thirst gives the note to the whole book. He writes:—

> 'The soul of man when it is healthy is athirst for God. . . . That is why we come to Church; that is why we pray. . . . Are we clergy afraid or ashamed to appeal to that divine spark which burns and glows in the depths of every human soul? Do we fear that such an appeal will awake no response, and is this why we preach about politics, work and wages, last week's newspapers, anything rather than the Gospel of Christ? The great religious teachers, who have a real message, never lower themselves like this, and they do touch the hearts of their hearers.' (p. 37.)

The next three chapters deal with *Faith*, *Hope*, and *Joy* as virtues distinctive of Christianity.

> 'Love, joy, peace, faith, hope, humility: these are the characteristic Christian ideas. Whenever these words threaten to drop out of our vocabulary or are used with an unpleasant suspicion of unreality, cant, or affectation, we may be sure that we are losing the essence of the Christian spirit, and are falling back into paganism. It is an absolutely sure and scientific test. If we do not want the words that Christianity had to coin to express its new ideas, the reason must be that we have lost the ideas themselves.' (p. 63.)

One could wish that the Dean had added chapters on the other Christian ideas, and we can hope that he will repair the omission. As it is he has written of *Self-Consecration*, *The World*, and *Bereavement*. It is impossible in any way to summarise these chapters. Some phrases remain in the memory. 'Faith is a kind of climbing instinct.' 'If we would devote ourselves to God, we must see to it that we have a self to devote.' 'It is not a living death, but a dying life to which we pledge ourselves.' 'Bereavement is the deepest initiation into the mysteries of human life.' 'It has been said of a great man that he passed through the dream of life as one awake.' 'No one before Christ had made Hope a moral virtue.' 'A generation which wishes a religion without tears must find it difficult to adjust its beliefs to the teaching of the New Testament and to the facts of life.' The Dean clearly distinguishes joy from pleasure, and he says:—

> 'Joy has an eternal quality. . . . Joy is the triumph of *life*; it is a sign that we are living our true life as spiritual beings. We are sent into the world to become something and to make something

> The two are in practice so closely connected as to be almost inseparable. Our personality expands by creativeness, and creates spontaneously as it expands. Joy is the signal that we are spiritually alive and active. Wherever joy is, creation has been; and the richer the creation, the deeper the joy.' (p. 64.)

The attitude of the Dean to social questions is perhaps clearer and more sympathetic here than in any of his other books. Christianity, he says, is other-worldly. 'The good Christian has already ascended in heart and mind with Christ.' 'But it is other-worldliness which alone can transform this world.'

> 'The advance of civilisation is in truth a sort of by-product of Christianity, not its chief aim; . . . we can appeal to history to support us that this progress is most stable and genuine when it is a by-product of a lofty and unworldly idealism. It is not quite certain that Christianity either requires or promises what we commonly mean by the progress of humanity. Personally I hope for it, as a matter of reasonable faith, not so much from a study of history, which shows us life becoming ever more complex, but not much better or happier; but rather because if the life of humanity has any unitary purpose and meaning in the mind of the Creator, it must, one would think, be intended to exhibit the same kind of advance which we can trace in individual lives which are well lived. But the progress of humanity if there is any, is very slow and always precarious; and it cannot go on for ever.' (p. 84.)

The hopes and ambitions of improving our civilisation are not to be abandoned. 'If we give up trying to find the hand of God in human history while we fix our eyes only on eternity, our minds will dwell in an empty heaven; we shall grasp at infinity and find only zero.' 'And let us remember when we are inclined to be disheartened that the private soldier is a poor judge of the fortunes of a great battle.'

The frontispiece of the book is a photograph of Paula Inge, who died a year ago. Her father has put as a preface a beautiful poem in Latin:

> *'Nondum bis senos aetas tua viderat annos;*
> *explesti spatio tempora longa brevi.'*

In the last chapter he tells us something of her, and it is not our least debt to him. As he writes:

> 'At a time when so much of our literature is strangely blind to the glory and excellence of human nature at its best, I do not think we can be blamed for making known what we have ourselves seen of the beauty of holiness in a short life.'

No book of devotion can answer to all the variety of religious experience. The young may find little in this which re-echoes that gaiety which is inextricably mingled with much of their religious experience; not here is the song of the *joculatores Domini* nor the glad morning of a new adventure. It is not that the shadow of bereavement lies heavily on these pages: rather it has given to them a rare quality. The joy is real, but it is like the joy of autumn. Nor is the Dean quite at one with those whose religious experience is to themselves hardly separable from the Church—that Body of Christ as imperfect as they are themselves. It is perhaps in the tradition of Neo-Platonism that it should find religion primarily as a personal relation of the soul to God, while another tradition emphasises that in the deepest religious experience the more real God becomes to us, the more real becomes our brother; or as some would put it—the deepest religious experience is not to be found apart from our

brother in the sacraments of the visible Church. But these are not meant to be criticisms; for we are all individuals, and that means that in the last resort our emphasis in the deepest things is just a little different from our neighbour's. We have every reason to be grateful to the Dean for this book. None can read it without interest, few without spiritual gain. Not least are we glad if it does something to dispel the illusion that modern theology has become solely intellectual and without any vital religious life. We would say of it as its author says of his daughter:—

'Huc veluti sacras accedebamus ad aras;
hic dulcis pietas hic habitat amor.'

H.G.M.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE MALINES CONFERENCES.

SIR,

In view of the Malines Conferences and the controversy which they have aroused I think the following letter deserves to be better known. It is headed: 'To the Rev. ———, on reunion with Rome,' and dated from Christ Church, Oxford, on February 27th, 1895:

'I regard all theories of possible corporate reunion with Rome as the merest illusion. If the history of the last fifty years has taught us nothing else, it has surely taught us *that*. It is not merely a question of Papal supremacy; it is the whole mass of Roman obedience and usage, of Roman principle and standpoint, the whole atmosphere, theological and ethical, in which Roman Catholic life energizes, that constitutes for us the impossibility of reunion. We dare not accept responsibility for Romanism as it is, and as, except for some inconceivable revolution in Latin Church opinion, it is likely to continue. Even if the bare letter of the Tridentine Decrees were all that we had to do with, it would form a barrier insurmountable. But behind and around that stretches all that is covered by the *magisterium* of the Latin Church, and that those who submit to her must assimilate. I grieve over ———'s idealism. We have no right to indulge in dreams which are dissipated by facts.'*

The learned and saintly author of 'And now, O Father, mindful of the love' was, in the words of his biographer, 'devotedly loyal to Catholic truth.'

T. F. ROYDS.

HAUGHTON RECTORY,
STAFFORD.

* *Letters of William Bright, D.D.*, p. 257.

SIR,

Surely Canon Quick's observations are entirely unjustified. It is more than childish to accuse Modernists of condemning free discussion.

No school of thought admires more than the Modernists do the spirit which animates the Archbishop's actions in his dealings with the Eastern Churches, the Free Churchmen, and the Roman Catholics. But what we all are justified in asking is that in all such efforts to approach other churches, our own faith shall be clearly defined.

The Roman Church can teach us many things, possibly we can teach them something. But there is one great question on which we differ, and must continue to differ, even while we may join in friendly and brotherly co-operation—that is the question as to what is the final test of truth.

All Anglicans *who think* believe that we derive our faith through the Bible, tradition, and the Revelation of God in Nature, but that the truths thus reached must be submitted to the final test of the reason and conscience, with which our Maker has endowed us. Most, if not all, Romans now believe that the final test of truth is the decision of the Pope, when speaking *ex cathedra*. If this difference is kept clearly in view, the more conferences we have the better.

BERESFORD POTTER.

RAKE MANOR,
MILFORD, SURREY.
27th February, 1924.

SIR,

We do not usually have to complain of irrelevance from Mr. Fawkes, but really that is characteristic of his sermon at Hereford. It is on negotiations for union with Rome; but there are no such things. He himself speaks of our not understanding one another, and these conversations are simply intended as one way of diminishing that ignorance. Surely they are not to be avoided for fear of their leading to something better. Are we not allowed to learn from Keble:

> 'Speak gently of our sister's fall:
> Who knows but gentle love
> May win her at our patient call,
> The surer way to prove?'

Meanwhile you have done a real service by your exposition of the dividing points between us.

HENRY LAURENCE.

EYNSFORD, KENT.

[The word 'negotiations' does not, I think, occur in my sermon; and it is not easy to find a term for 'these overtures, or conversations, or whatever they were'—to use the Irish Primate's phrase—to which exception may not be taken. If it were an English word, *pourparlers* would perhaps be the best.

If the discussions in question were purely private and personal, they concern only those who took part in them. But it seems to me impossible to regard them in this light. All that has taken place in connexion with them forbids us to do so. Two Cardinals, those of Malines and Westminster, and two Primates, those of England and Ireland, have made them the subject of public and official comment. Private and personal conversations are not treated in this way. On the Anglican side they are, we have been told, the outcome of a declaration made by the Lambeth Conference of 1920 that: 'Should the Church of Rome at any time desire to discuss conditions of re-union, we shall be ready to welcome such discussions.' The words are proper, if somewhat abstract. The mistake, on whose part we need not enquire, lay in supposing that there either was, or could be, such a desire on the part of the Church of Rome. There was none; nor can there be. The temper of this Church is not that of the venerable author of *The Christian Year*. She does not regard herself as 'our sister'; and it is a matter of complete indifference to her whether we do, or do not, 'speak gently' of her 'fall.'

Those of us who 'dream on the soothing dream' of Re-union with her would do well to reflect on Cardinal Bourne's recent Lenten Pastoral. All discussions, he tells us,

> 'are useless and mere waste of time, unless the doctrine of the Infallibility of the successors of St. Peter is accepted. There can be

no question of a compromise built up on the acceptance, or rejection, or mere toleration of a certain number of religious opinions. The criticisms passed by non-Catholic writers on the published accounts of the conversations at Malines have brought out very clearly the fundamental difference there is between those who accept the Supreme Authority of the Holy See as an essential fact of the Divine Revelation, and the outlook of those who reject that authority. The latter have apparently lost all perception of the Catholic idea of "faith." All ultimately is reduced to a question of more or less certain religious opinions, in which there can be adjustments, concessions, compromises, arrangements. To a Catholic, such a conception is impossible, nay, repellent.'

This, and nothing short of it, is the formal teaching of Rome.

A. FAWKES.]

THE ARGUMENT FROM DESIGN.

SIR,

A friend of mine has just called my attention to a review, which you were good enough to publish in your January number, of *The Divine Argument Reconsidered*, of which Mr. McCabe and I are joint authors.

May I point out that the review contains an odd mis-statement of fact, and that this mis-statement is made the basis of the reviewer's whole criticism? He accuses me of 'slipping into the "Either-or" fallacy'—*i.e.* of repeating the old-fashioned argument that the beauty and orderliness of Nature must be *either* pure accident *or* due to conscious design—and says that Prof. Webb in his introduction condones this lapse. The latter charge will not seem very probable to anyone who knows Prof. Webb. As a matter of fact I again and again repudiated the conclusion that we have to choose between accident and design. On page 6 I protested that 'law' does not imply a 'law giver', and alleged certain mathematical uniformities as proof of this assertion. On page 10 and page 26 I criticised the conception of God as the 'Divine Lamplighter' who 'lights the evening star.' See also pages 1, 2, 24, 55 and the title of Chapter I. Indeed my whole aim was to show that the old antithesis is unsatisfactory; and yet that the Design Argument in its popular form is 'an attempt to express a thought of profound importance,' which therefore needs to be presented in a revised statement. Your reviewer holds that the interpretation of beauty in terms of adaptation to environment 'may be inadequate.' When I frame a detailed argument to show *why* it is inadequate, he blames me—not because my argument is incorrect, but because 'men of science' won't stand it 'at present.' This excessive deference to the fashion of the present moment is, surely, a little disappointing in a distinguished organ of Liberal theology. The bearing of 'Darwinism' on aesthetics has hitherto been very inadequately discussed; and the up-hill work of calling attention to neglected subjects of study deserves more sympathy than your reviewer expresses.

CHARLES J. SHEBBEARE.

[The remark which I quoted from Professor Webb's preface misled me into finding what was not there. I regret that I should have misunderstood and misrepresented Mr. Shebbeare. I suppose what actuated my remarks was that students of science will have nothing to do to-day either with 'purpose' or with 'accident.' As for my excessive deference to the men of science, I pay that to their singular intellectual integrity. We all owe them very much there.

J.C.H.]